Security Council

Sixty-sixth year

Provisional

6479th meeting
Friday, 11 February 2011, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Ms. Machado/Mrs. Dunlop/Mr. Moretti/	(Brazil)
Members:	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ms. Čolaković
	China	Mr. Tian Lin
	Colombia	Mr. Alzate
	France	Mr. Jaillon
	Gabon	Mr. Ngyema Ndong
	Germany	Mr. Retzlaff
	India	Mr. Kumar
	Lebanon	Mr. Jaber
	Nigeria	Mr. Adamu
	Portugal	Mr. Moraes Cabral
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	South Africa	Mr. Sangqu
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Steele
	United States of America	Mr. Donegan

Agenda

Maintenance of international peace and security

The interdependence between security and development

Letter dated 2 February 2011 from the Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2011/50)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506.

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.10 p.m.

The President: I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than four minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously.

I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mr. Sinhaseni (Thailand): As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica indicated this morning, I am speaking today on behalf of the Human Security Network, which comprises Austria, Chile, Costa Rica as Chair, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand and Slovenia, and South Africa as an observer.

Let me also extend my sincere appreciation to you, Madame President, for convening this open debate of the Council. Security, development and human rights are the three interdependent pillars of the United Nations system. The Human Security Network feels strongly that the Council should consider this interdependence when formulating peacekeeping mandates. This would enhance the effectiveness of peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts in promoting sustainable peace and development.

The Network is a group of developed and developing countries united by our belief in using a people-centred approach to address interrelated challenges. Every individual should be guaranteed freedom from fear and freedom from want, with equal opportunities to develop their human potential. Achieving and balancing these two pillars of human security will help to build a lasting foundation for effective transition from conflict, sustainable peace and meaningful, people-centred development.

That said, we are equally convinced that no attempt to establish security today can ignore the essential role of human rights. Security, development and human rights all depend on one another. It is difficult to achieve one without the other. In particular, respect for human rights in each and every country is an essential contribution to peace and security on the national, regional and international levels. We believe that it is essential to recognize this.

Over the years, the experience of the United Nations in peacekeeping operations and subsequent post-conflict peacebuilding and development has shown that security, development and human rights are inextricably linked. This has revealed that sustainable development and promoting human rights help to address the root causes of conflict, as acknowledged in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Promoting development through the reduction and prevention of armed violence" (A/64/228).

Therefore, a comprehensive approach to security means that post-conflict peacebuilding must be closely linked to the primary responsibilities of the Council. There is a broad understanding today that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are not a linear process but should go hand in hand. The various actors in these fields are obliged to cooperate and coordinate closely. In this regard, we welcome the current efforts of the Secretariat to develop an early peacebuilding strategy for peacekeepers, which would also help to facilitate a smooth transition from peacekeeping missions to other forms of United Nations engagement. We must also explore further how the Council can also consider future development priorities early on.

The Network recognizes that the mandates of the Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council are clearly separate. At the same time, that does not mean we should refrain from pursuing coordination and system-wide coherence within the entire United Nations system. Overall coordination with financial institutions is also key.

National ownership must also be a core element in all peacekeeping and peacebuilding mandates and missions. Peacekeepers come and go, but only national participation, involvement and ownership from all segments of society, particularly disadvantaged groups such as women and children, can create the sort of organic development that will sustain long-term peace. Better integration of all these dimensions of security can also result in the greater inclusion of women and those groups previously excluded from decision-making processes. The promotion of human rights and the strengthening of the rule of law are essential in this context.

The Brazilian presidency of the Council has drafted a very concise concept paper for today's open debate (S/2011/50). It has framed our discussions well while pointing the way forward in a clear manner. The Network wishes to share its view on a key action identified in the concept paper.

We believe that the Council must increasingly make a habit of considering the root causes and socio-economic dynamics of all conflict situations on its agenda. It should be encouraged to interact more through informal dialogue with relevant stakeholders during the whole cycle of peacekeeping missions. This means, in particular, interaction with the affected countries, the troop- and police-contributing countries, and key financial institutions, as well as drawing on the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission.

This interaction and coordination need to be enhanced. We should explore what formal linkages can be established to ensure that the Council can more actively and systematically take into account a comprehensive picture of the causes of conflict and sustainable ways to address those causes.

Members of the Network have the common objective to promote the full development of human potential and the ability of people to live in dignity, free from fear and free from want. Both security and development are therefore integral components of our common vision and objective. We fully support taking this agenda forward in the Council.

Lastly, in my national capacity, let me state that Thailand sees development as key to promoting human security, potential and dignity. Our policies reflect this recognition. As a police- and troop-contributing country, Thailand is actively engaged with the recent deployment of more than 600 infantry soldiers in Darfur who, as I speak today, are being joined by a further 200 troops to meet the full complement of 800. Our naval vessels are also currently involved in patrols off the coast of Somalia. We look forward to doing our part to strengthen the effectiveness of the Council-mandated role and to promote a more integrated and comprehensive assessment of conflict situations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Sumi (Japan): I would like to congratulate you, Madame President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and to commend the initiative of Brazil in organizing the present debate.

Japan shares Brazil's interest in focusing on the interdependence between security and development. It is our responsibility, as members of the international community, to establish a system to ensure a seamless transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding and development without delay.

Japan recently assumed the chair of the Peacebuilding Commission's Working Group on Lessons Learned and has initiated consultations on this year's work plan. Japan will strive, in cooperation with the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, to ensure concrete outcomes and pursue clearly defined follow-up in the Group's work. Through the agenda that we wish to take up in the Working Group, Japan intends to respond to some of the questions raised by the Council President today, including the issue of strengthening the relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council.

Today, Japan would like to offer some practical proposals for making progress in three areas.

The first is enhancing coordination. We have been consistently emphasizing the importance of ensuring coordination, complementarities and coherence among diverse actors, such as the entities of the United Nations system and international financial institutions. We are happy to hear that integrated strategic planning is progressing, but more work is required throughout the United Nations system to ensure a clear division of labour and allocation of resources to focused priorities.

To that end, there should be strong leadership on the ground. The reports of the Secretary-General should include more extensive analysis of the status of the integration process and the socio-economic elements that affect security. That would provide greater guidance as to how we can refocus our efforts on fewer priorities and where more resources and attention need to be invested. Japan intends to take up the issue in the Working Group on Lessons Learned so that the Peacebuilding Commission can make a greater contribution in that area.

Secondly, the peacebuilding tasks carried out by peacekeepers are often described in three words: "articulate, enable and implement". Peacekeepers cannot undertake all peacebuilding tasks. Efforts should first be made to enable others to implement them.

However, some peacebuilding tasks must be directly implemented by peacekeepers. At present, there is insufficient capacity worldwide for typical peacebuilding mandates of peacekeepers, such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration,

security sector reform and establishment of the rule of law. It is urgent that we accelerate our efforts, on the basis of the findings of the forthcoming review of international civilian capacities, to institute a system for fostering and deploying civilian capacities to that end.

Furthermore, I would like to underscore the importance of generating youth employment and avoiding a vicious circle in which young people lacking employment resort to arms and conflict. The peace dividend must include security and jobs. There are many ways in which peacekeeping missions could have a positive impact on the local economy through strengthened collaboration with development actors. Quick-impact projects and efforts to increase local procurement of goods and services are examples of areas in which such cooperation could be pursued. The missions and the development community should also develop national staff policies so as to avoid a drain of talented people away from the local labour market and to take advantage of opportunities for local institution-building.

To avoid a relapse into resorting to arms, I would further point out that there may be cases in which we could benefit from enhancing cooperation between peacekeeping missions and the panels of experts that monitor sanctions. For instance, a peacekeeping mission could be mandated to monitor sanctions in cooperation with a given panel of experts.

The third area concerns women's empowerment. Women are the key to development and security. The international community has just commemorated the tenth anniversary of resolution 1325 (2000) and established UN Women. The international community should make a concerted effort to maximize the current political momentum so as to bring more attention to the role of women.

In that regard, Japan welcomes the recommendations put forward in the recently released impact study on the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security in peacekeeping. One practical way in which we can make a difference is to increase the number of female military and police officers joining peacekeeping missions.

In conclusion, Madame President, I would like to reiterate Japan's standing commitment to progress in the peacekeeping and peacebuilding areas and our readiness to work with the international community towards the common goal of ensuring a smooth transition to sustainable peace, security and development.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): I wish to congratulate you, Madame President, on the attendance and your presidency today. I would like to thank you for convening this debate.

At the outset, I wish to say that I find something terribly short, or missing, in this house today, an imperative that should not have been overlooked. While I appreciate the fact that our document today (S/2011/50) is a concept paper arising from last month's discussions on institution-building and post-conflict peacebuilding, there must be more emphasis on financial availability. Much of what we are saying here today — and what I am hearing here today — would have been better put had more stress been placed on making finances available. The sum of $350 million on peacekeeping and peacebuilding is a very small percentage contribution by the United Nations to this awesome — really awesome — task before us. It is not enough.

Having stressed the imperative of talking about finances, I now move to today's theme. I would like to speak about a comprehensive approach. While we might envisage that comprehensive approach as already happening, it is not.

We have not been addressing the root causes of conflict through such means as the peaceful settlement of disputes — the preventive factor. We have not been disengaging conflicting parties and reducing violence by deploying initial peacekeeping. We have not been creating conditions conducive to socio-political stability through innovative peacebuilding. We have not ensured overall coordination among all stakeholders, especially here, to forge synergies. Those are the four pillars of a comprehensive approach which need to be re-examined.

I speak of four possible ways of going forward. Conflict analysis cannot be rationalized without addressing the underlying causes. A dispassionate analysis is needed for effective intervention. The Council's presidential statement of 23 September 2010 (S/PRST/2010/18) underlined that fact. We must also understand, within and outside the United Nations, that

peacekeeping and peacebuilding are disciplines with cross-cutting themes. They have the common objective of preventing a relapse into conflict. Ten United Nations missions are performing that task at the moment, but neither process is explicitly defined, and they must be. I believe that national ownership and local actors must be involved to ensure smooth implementation. The impression that the two disciplines are competing for resources and attention must be dispelled. We can minimize the chances of relapse through that alone. The Security Council can discharge its Charter responsibilities only by adopting a judicious and not merely political approach.

Finally, as I have stated, we must ensure coordination within and without the United Nations. First of all, when we speak of coordination, our principal organs — the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Secretariat — and the regional organizations must choose to address any issue in one chosen form. The issue must be vetted, discussed and put together in a way that can produce cohesion. I believe that I must stress to the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission how important the Commission's role is in putting together, jointly with all those organs, a cohesive programme and in refining the nexus between all these bodies.

I believe that international financial institutions tied to the United Nations must be brought into more significant play and urged to make more significant contributions. I believe that all this is within the purview of the Secretariat and the immense efforts of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. And, finally, I reiterate that a comprehensive solution and approach, which must be coordinated to the maximum possible, is the only way to move forward.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Honduras.

Ms. Flores (Honduras) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to congratulate Brazil on assuming this month's presidency of the Security Council, as well as the new members on their election. I take this opportunity to express our gratitude and firm commitment to cooperating with all of them. We acknowledge the wise decision to convene this debate on interdependence between security and development for consideration by Member States, both as a contribution to this topic and as a gesture of transparency in the working methods of the Security Council.

I also wish to thank the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, and Ms. Cliffe of the World Bank for their statements.

The fast-paced transformation of communications over the past few decades has created a new reality for the coexistence and interrelationship of the people in the world in which we live. Nothing is outside of knowledge, and there are no limitations of distance or ignorance when we can obtain, in mere seconds, information on events taking place on the far side of the planet. So graphic and instantaneous is the transmission of information that there are no isolated nations or peoples who might feel themselves imprisoned by the confining geography of their borders when those borders extend as far as, or should we say as close to, the most distant regions of the world.

Our peoples today can compare and contrast the realities of our nations in an instant solely by observing their surroundings and beyond. The limitations of scant development, compared to the comforts enjoyed by the more fortunate countries, make national deficiencies, injustices, shortages and gaps apparent with crude intensity and an increased sense of the enormous gulf of inequality that separates us.

Recognizing with crystal clarity what others have achieved, and what underdevelopment denies, deepens dissatisfaction and triggers a rebellion of spirit among those who lack in their lives what others have in overabundance. No one can feel resignation in the presence of these terrible differences. I am speaking of those who have been marginalized from the blessings of development and have no access to health, education or other opportunities for individual and collective advancement. The sense of powerlessness to achieve a decent standard of living — a right due to the vast multitudes who, in different latitudes of the Earth, subsist in the most precarious economic and social conditions — is undeniably a latent source of conflict.

I ramble on about these concepts precisely because I come from a corner of the world where such conspicuous and painful conditions of vulnerability can be found. We can testify to the threats posed to internal peace, in the smallest context, or to world peace, in a more universal perspective, by the continued exacerbation of these distressing circumstances and deep-rooted causes that breed discontent and create flash points for conflict. However, just as I am not indifferent to those evils, I can at the same time attest

to the great benefit that accrues to domestic peace from the enthusiastic provision of assistance to those who require a helping hand to escape the invisibility of their pathetic realities.

Honduras has been hard hit by the appalling violence of discord leading to conflict and by Mother Nature's fatal and destructive blows. My country has overcome difficult times with diligence and enormous faith, assisted by the helping hands of good friends to whom we are infinitely grateful. By closing the distance between need and abundance, all resources invested in development and in providing opportunities to those who see their opportunities to advance and succeed truncated are a contribution to international peace and security.

The financing and cooperation that are required in the continual struggle for well-being should not be denied to the people of any nation. Indeed, we need reform to ensure that all those resources that are wasted, funds that are squandered in large amounts, and money that is spent on superfluous things when essentials are lacking are made available to development, with an emphasis on the most vulnerable and fragile sectors of our communities, in order to prevent the deterioration of our ecosystems. That would make the greatest contribution to peace in and among nations and to global security.

With respect to the question underlying the topic we are addressing, what can the delegations of this world Organization do to contribute to that end? We respectfully suggest that a taskforce be created among us, with sufficient power to identify the existence and provenance of resources, and to recommend their reallocation once it has been concluded that they are being poorly used. Impatience causes anxiety, just as the possibility of change gives cause for hope. Our peoples are eager for solutions that will improve their fate and brighten their future. It is imperative to defuse the outbreaks of impatience and convert them into sources of hope.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I would like to thank Brazil for convening this important debate, which of course goes to the heart of the United Nations role and responsibilities to help foster conditions for peace, stability, prosperity and economic opportunity for all Member States and their peoples.

All speakers today have reaffirmed that peace, security and development are inextricably linked and require a comprehensive approach. The Security Council has an organic and decisive role to play in that. We see constantly how the lack of development opportunities is one of the fundamental underlying causes of conflict. We have all heard the statistics and are familiar with them — no low-income, fragile or conflict-affected country has yet achieved a single Millennium Development Goal. This fact should be compelling. Lack of development is itself an important contributor to conflict.

When the Council seeks to fulfil its responsibilities under the Charter it must be fully appraised of the root causes of the conflicts before it. The Council must continually seek fresh approaches to interact and work within the United Nations system, including with the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and institutional financial bodies, in order to fulfil its own responsibilities. This is needed not only during the post-conflict peacebuilding phase, but also as part of the Council's preventive diplomacy tool kit and in its mandate formulation.

Inclusive economic development can help to prevent conflict and its recurrence, as has been stated. Australia has learned from its own work on peace and security issues, particularly in our own region, the importance of taking this comprehensive, whole-of-Government approach that combines development assistance with defence, law enforcement and diplomatic resources.

The Council is obviously not the place to take on the core business of development, and no one is arguing that it should. Various actors must play to their mandates, strengths and comparative advantages. The General Assembly, United Nations committees, United Nations agencies, Member States and others must all do a better job in meeting development goals.

The Council should continue to mandate peacekeeping operations, support peacebuilding activities from the earliest stages of planning and implementation, and give this due attention in the renewal of mission mandates. It should continue to mandate integrated missions to ensure coherent approaches. It should encourage coordination and coherence within mission structures and between missions and other actors. We also need better definition of roles and responsibilities within the

United Nations system in key peacebuilding sectors. To properly consider development issues, the Council needs access, as we know, to contextual socio-economic information, and we welcome the Council's request that the Secretary-General include this information in reporting to it.

As mentioned by the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, the Commission is a unique organ within the United Nations that brings together security and development actors. It has a key role to play in coordination and in sharing lessons and best practice. We welcome the Council's intention to make greater use of the advisory role of the PBC. We hope that can be strengthened, and we certainly welcome steps to include the participation of PBC country-specific configuration chairs in Council briefings and informal interactive dialogues. This is a relationship that we all need to work at. Australia also encourages greater coordination between the Council and the World Bank, as we have seen today. And we support the comments made by the representative of South Africa on the important role of regional institutions.

Whether we are helping with the immediate task of restoring the rule of law, facilitating basic service delivery or helping build stable institutions for governance and economic growth, obviously we must do so with a view to promoting local leadership and ownership and inclusiveness, particularly of women and youth. We will not have security unless we give balance to promoting development in urban and rural settings alike. As others have said, it is important to identify from the beginning those activities that are most relevant to securing long-term stability and security, and we agree strongly with comments made by others about the importance of security sector reform and the rule of law.

Briefly, I will mention youth unemployment and the management of natural resources. As we all know and see today, youth unemployment can potentially be one of the most destabilizing elements in any society. We must handle this not only through supply-side activities — training and skills development — but through generating demand. That is easy to say. United Nations agencies and the banks need to give continuing priority to finding creative and effective ways to draw young people into productive society.

We will also not have security unless we ensure sound management of natural resources. As has been pointed out, in so many countries resource wealth has not translated into stability, and resources have had a particular role in fuelling a large number of conflicts. The so-called paradox of plenty is something with which we are all familiar, but little has been done in a coordinated way to see what it means and what can be done about it. This is something that the United Nations has yet to grapple with effectively.

The Intergovernmental Forum on Mining, Minerals, Metals and Sustainable Development, chaired by Malawi, has done good work, including on guidelines, and we welcome the fact that sustainable mining is one of the themes to be addressed at this year's session of the Commission on Sustainable Development.

In the meantime, much can also be achieved at the national level, and the onus does not rest solely with the host country. In many cases, it cannot easily do so. It is a growing priority in Australia's own development assistance to work with countries on natural resource management, including now in Africa. I will stop here without going into detail, but my written statement will say more about that.

In concluding, I would like to reiterate the Secretary-General's own call for stronger coherence by the United Nations across the security/development spectrum and stronger coordination with other actors. It is imperative, as we know, that we turn this enhanced coherence and coordination into a reality in the interests of the huge vulnerable communities of the world — most compellingly, the 1.5 billion people who live in countries affected by recurrent cycles of violence and are living with that violence today.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Belgium.

Mr. Grauls (Belgium): As I did at the Security Council debate on institution-building on 21 January (see S/PV.6472), today I also speak on behalf of the Permanent Representatives of Brazil, Canada, Jordan and Switzerland in our respective capacities as Chairs of the country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission for the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Burundi. We also associate ourselves with the remarks of the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), Ambassador Gasana of Rwanda.

We welcome Brazil's initiative to hold an open debate on this important topic, and would like to take this opportunity to offer our perspective based on our experiences. Our intervention has three elements: first, the need for a comprehensive approach to security and development; secondly, the unique role of the Peacebuilding Commission; and thirdly, the need for more coordination. History has shown time and again that there is a mutual interdependence among peace and security, development and human rights. Whereas in the short term there can be no inception of development without security, in the long term it is not possible to maintain security and achieve sustainable peace without development.

Therefore, a comprehensive approach to security taken by the Security Council and the entire United Nations system unavoidably needs to take account the social and economic situation on the ground in order to address the root causes of conflicts. Respect for human rights is an integral part and precondition of such a comprehensive approach, as there can be no real security and development in a repressive society.

An integrated and coherent combination of peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities is essential to attaining security and development goals alike. Closer interaction between peacekeepers and development actors, while respecting each other's roles and responsibilities, can certainly contribute to a more efficient and sustainable fulfilment of the peacebuilding-related tasks of peacekeeping operations, as representatives of funds and programmes are often more experienced and stay longer to deal with such issues as institution-building, the reintegration of communities affected by conflict, electoral support, economic revitalization, natural resource management, the provision of basic services and governance issues.

Peacebuilding activities can also contribute to increasing local support for peacekeeping missions. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, for example, a draft peace consolidation programme has been prepared in close cooperation with the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the United Nations country team, and it has been well received by the local authorities. Greater efforts must therefore be made to enhance the cooperation between peacekeepers and development actors, allowing for joint approaches in the interest of post-conflict countries.

The Peacebuilding Commission has a unique role to play in that regard, as the nexus between security and development lies at the heart of its mandate. Peacebuilding relates to building the foundations of society to avoid a relapse into conflict as much as to sowing the seeds for lasting development. For that reason, peacebuilding activities should start at the earliest stages of United Nations engagement.

The country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission serve as a forum for dialogue and coordination between all stakeholders in the country concerned, including United Nations agencies, bilateral partners, international financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations, both in the field and at the level of capitals. They also provide analysis and guidance on issues at the intersection of governance, security and development policy and advocate and mobilize resources for the post-conflict recovery agendas of the countries in question.

One of the most crucial partnerships for the country-specific configurations of the PBC has to do with building a privileged working relationship with the World Bank to design a coherent approach to the peacebuilding and development needs of the countries on its agenda, taking into account the views and needs of local stakeholders. This can be done through the organization of joint events such as donors' conferences and through stimulating a convergence between the peacebuilding and development frameworks of the country in question.

This unique role makes the Peacebuilding Commission and its country-specific configurations a valuable partner for a deepened strategic dialogue with the Security Council when designing a comprehensive approach to security. While some steps have already been taken in this regard, including the participation of configuration Chairs in Security Council briefings and interactive consultative dialogues, much more can be done to enhance this working relationship. When dealing with pressing peace and security issues, the Council could also benefit from information on development-related issues that may hinder the implementation of its mandates.

The advice of the Peacebuilding Commission could be sought on such issues through a flexible, multi-tiered approach, both at the outset and when assessing progress in these areas, including in progress

reports of the Secretary-General. As the Peacebuilding Commission accumulates more experience and takes on board more countries, it will gradually be in a position to provide better and richer advice to the Security Council, to the benefit of post-conflict countries.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): Canada, like others, congratulates Brazil on this important debate.

As Chair of the Sierra Leone configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission, Canada also fully associates itself with the statement just delivered by the Ambassador of Belgium on behalf of the country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC).

Today's debate reflects how far we have all moved beyond sterile discussions about whether security or development comes first; they are clearly interdependent. As the World Bank has shown, countries plagued by war are also the ones lagging furthest behind in attaining the Millennium Development Goals. Painful experience also demonstrates that social and economic inequalities can cause and even exacerbate conflict. Women and children suffer particularly harsh consequences as a result of conflict. It can take many years, or even decades, to restore their social and economic well-being.

This poses significant challenges for the United Nations. One of the primary challenges is organizational. Canada's adoption of a whole-of-government approach in Haiti, the Sudan and Afghanistan has demonstrated that working in a coherent fashion yields dividends. Yet successful integration requires clarity about roles and responsibilities, a common strategy and the ability to act rapidly in response to changing realities. Despite recent progress, the United Nations must continue to improve in these respects. Duplication of roles and responsibilities still exists among United Nations departments, agencies and programmes, and Headquarters support to senior leaders in the field is too frequently delayed or inadequate.

It is not only within the United Nations system where improved coordination is essential. As noted in last year's Dili Declaration and eloquently expressed by the Group of Seven Plus, national ownership is necessary for effective peacebuilding. The international community must better align assistance behind national priorities, thereby enabling the more rapid re-establishment of core Government functions.

The interdependence of security and development also points to the need for rapid access to tailored civilian deployable expertise. In that regard, Canada looks forward to the recommendations of the review of international civilian capacities.

Beyond the United Nations, the international community as a whole must also be ready to respond. There is an urgent need to reinforce national capacity and engage expertise resident in the global South, especially in the areas of governance, the rule of law, public administration, women, peace and security and basic social services.

While a case-by-case approach is needed, it is also clear that recurrent gaps exist. For example, governance and the rule of law consistently emerge as areas of weakness, with the justice sector frequently suffering from inadequate attention. This unbalanced approach is especially dangerous given that the establishment of a functioning, capable State is a fundamental precondition for lasting security and sustainable development.

Finally, the interdependence between security and development has implications for the work of the Council. The growing practice of designating integrated missions with mandates to coordinate a coherent United Nations approach is of course welcome. However, it will be important to draw on the comparative advantages within the United Nations system wherever possible, rather than expanding the range of responsibilities imposed on peace operations.

These are areas in which enhanced cooperation with the Peacebuilding Commission offers much promise. Not only has the PBC begun to establish partnerships with relevant development partners, including the World Bank and regional organizations, but its composition and mandate are ideally suited to working at the nexus between security and development.

(*spoke in French*)

Two roles should be strengthened. First, the Security Council should increasingly draw on, and the Peacebuilding Commission better provide, concrete

analysis on development issues that either undermine security in the short term or will require early action to deliver peace dividends.

Secondly, the Commission can deepen its engagement with a wider circle of peacebuilding actors in order to better coordinate efforts and systematize lessons learned. At the country level, the PBC configurations provide the constant and close attention necessary to gaps, resource needs and the less pressing consideration of questions of sequencing. Within the United Nations system, the Commission can also play an important role by encouraging greater cohesion within the United Nations peacebuilding architecture and by supporting reform processes outlined in the Secretary-General's reports, as well as the five-year peacebuilding architecture and civilian capacity reviews. More regular interaction between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, especially in advance of defining mission mandates and in the context of transition processes, could enhance the ability of both parties to work more effectively.

In conclusion, Madame President, let me assure you of Canada's continued commitment to improving the ability of the United Nations to meet these strategic and organizational challenges and to strengthen the foundations for development in the long-term.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. Apakan (Turkey): At the outset, I would like to thank the presidency of Brazil for organizing this open debate on this important issue.

I wish to also commend Ambassador Viotti, Permanent Representative of Brazil, and her team for preparing the comprehensive concept note (S/2011/50) and the presidential statement (S/PRST/2011/4), which highlight the issues and challenges that require greater attention by the United Nations and other actors involved in security and development.

I shall dwell upon only a few points that I believe are of particular importance.

In the past couple of years, the Security Council has been very much preoccupied with how to improve its response to conflict situations. In that context, it has grappled with the need to establish the right connections between peacekeeping and peacebuilding and, in that regard, between security and development. This suggests that there is an ever growing recognition that sustainable peace cannot be solely based on security or development and that both should go hand in hand so as to form a coherent whole.

There is no doubt that conflict stalls development and the lack of development breeds further instability and strife. There is a vicious circle between conflict and underdevelopment, which needs to be broken through coherent, inclusive and holistic strategies. We have to be cautious not to adopt simplistic approaches and generalizations, since the relationship between peace, security and development depends on a complex web of issues and every conflict situation has its own specific dynamics and conditions that need to be taken into account in calibrating our policies.

A unique mix of factors influences the interplay between security and development in each country. In that regard, we need to pay particular attention to the context-specific political dynamics and institutional features in each country to ensure an environment where lasting security and development can be made possible.

To achieve durable security and development, we should ensure the active engagement of all local stakeholders. It is of critical importance to work closely with the local people. National ownership and national responsibility are key factors for sustainable peace.

As the Secretary-General underlined in his statement, fragile countries facing stark inequality and weak institutions are at increased risk of conflict. For this reason, it is important to build and strengthen national institutions. In our efforts, we should give due consideration to production capacity and job creation as well.

A regional approach is also necessary for our efforts to succeed. In many cases, both security and development have regional implications. In our view, effective cooperation at the regional level, an active role played by subregional and regional organizations and close coordination and partnership among various United Nations entities, the World Bank and other financial and regional organizations are of particular importance.

On the other hand, the linkage between security and development is also changing. There is therefore a need for a new and fresh assessment to better cope with evolving challenges.

We should also pay due attention to the need to improve the effectiveness and impact of ongoing peacebuilding programmes and activities, which, among other things, require the deployment of staff with a better understanding of the interlinkages between security and development.

We should also place special emphasis on the role of women in all phases of our efforts in peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development. We should further try to ensure increased participation by women.

Rethinking development policies, investing in preventive diplomacy, building capacities and integrating peacekeeping and peacebuilding are all priority issues for Turkey. As an emerging donor country, we will continue to actively pursue these issues within the United Nations and other forums.

With this understanding, Turkey will host the fourth United Nations Conference on the Least-Developed Countries next may in Istanbul. We expect that the Conference will bring fresh impetus to the process of development cooperation in assisting least developed countries move towards sustainable economic growth and development. In that regard, we hope that the crucial interrelationship between development and security will be an important part of our discussions in Istanbul.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Núñez Mosquera (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): It is a great pleasure to see you, Madame President, presiding over this meeting of the Security Council. I also congratulate you on the initiative of your Government to promote this open debate of the Council on such a relevant and topical issue.

As expressly indicated in the note (S/2011/50) sent by Her Excellency Mrs. Maria Luiza Ribeiro Viotti, Permanent Representative of Brazil, to all Member States on 2 February, the provisions of the Organization's Charter are clear and it is unquestionably a fact that the responsibilities of the Security Council lie in, and are limited to, the field of international peace and security.

It is not the purpose of this debate — nor would Cuba support it — for the Security Council to deal with economic and social development issues, which are the remit of other principal organs of the United Nations. However, it is important to highlight the economic and social difficulties that are the root causes of many conflicts that, regrettably, seem to be either ignored or disregarded.

In the last two years of the 1980s, when the bipolar world of international relations that had existed for many years was about to come to an end, the Security Council approved five new peacekeeping operations. However, it is important to recall that the Council had only established 13 such operations in all of the preceding 40 years.

That was the trend in the work of the Security Council as we left behind the bipolar world in order to enter a new period that we thought would be characterized by a multipolar approach to international relations in which all countries, large and small, would enjoy equal opportunity and have the same say in the decision-making process. The reality, however, proved to be otherwise. We all became involved in the current unipolar global order.

In the 1990s, at the request of the Security Council, the then Secretary-General introduced his well-known report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111), which was much discussed at the time, as it contained proposals and approaches considered by many to be harmful to the sovereignty of States. Nevertheless, that document was followed almost to the letter, and the total budget for peacekeeping operations now stands at nearly $7.82 billion — that is, 1.35 times the regular budget of the United Nations.

However, "An Agenda for Development" (A/48/935), which the same Secretary-General submitted shortly afterwards at the request of the General Assembly, did not receive the same support, nor was it defended with the same enthusiasm. On the contrary, the document has been neglected.

The word "underdevelopment" has virtually disappeared from the United Nations vocabulary, and other principal organs that have responsibility for economic and social development issues, such as the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly itself, have seen how the Security Council has usurped many of their functions, with disastrous results. It is enough to point out that the United Nations budget devotes only little more than $965 million to activities in the economic and social fields.

That is so, even though more than 1 billion people worldwide are hungry. Nearly 900 million cannot read or write, 120 million live in extreme poverty, and 3 billion suffer water shortages. Among children, 150 million have a low birth weight, 325 million do not go to school, and every day in underdeveloped countries 33,000 die from curable diseases. Food prices significantly rise, and foreign debt continues to deepen the structural crisis of the economies of underdeveloped countries.

It is an offence to human sensitivity to know that infant mortality in poor countries is 12 times higher than in rich countries. It is simply the consequence of the unjust international economic order that has been imposed on us and which must be urgently replaced by a more just and equitable new international economic order.

For Third World countries, the neoliberal model imposed since the late 1980s and early 1990s only brought about apparent growth, reflected in macroeconomic figures on paper. However, the difference between the rich and the poor significantly grew, just as the vulnerability of States and the concentration of wealth and privileges increased. While four decades ago, the first list of least developed countries included 24 States, today it includes 50 States. Nevertheless, if the commitment undertaken 40 years ago to allocate 0.7 per cent of the gross domestic product of developed countries to official development assistance were fulfilled, that assistance would increase to more than $160 billion — that is, more than twice its current amount.

The United Nations has put particular emphasis on its efforts in pursuit of political stability, sometimes through questionable means that undermine the principles of the sovereign equality of States and non-interference in their internal affairs, which are crucial to the proper functioning of the Organization. However, it has overlooked the fact that to achieve political stability, economic and social development needs must be met.

In that context, it is significant that currently, world military expenditures exceed the astronomical figure of $1.4 trillion, which is higher than what was spent during the so-called cold war era, except that in today's unipolar world, only one country is responsible for almost 50 per cent of the expenditure.

That astronomical figure is precisely what should be the source of resources for development, because what is the point of us talking about peace and security for the hundreds of millions of hungry and sick people in the underdeveloped and marginalized countries of the South? What sense can that have for them when their lives are limited to the daily struggle for mere survival?

There is a close link between disarmament and development, and peace cannot be achieved without resources for development. As Fidel Castro pointed out in his message to the eleventh United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, held in the city of São Paulo in 2004 — in your friendly country, Madame President — for the first time in history, man has produced the technical capacity for his complete self-destruction but, on the other hand, has not been able to create minimum guarantees for the security and integrity of all countries equally.

Nuclear weapons are a very serious unresolved issue. Their possible use would have unimaginable consequences. The experiences of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are today a minimum indication of what could happen, given the infinitely superior destructive potential of contemporary nuclear weapons. The only guarantee that nuclear weapons will not be used by States, or by anyone, would be their destruction, along with the generation of recently developed conventional arms that are almost as deadly. The Non-Aligned Movement proposed a plan to eliminate and ban nuclear weapons by no later than 2025. Cuba will redouble its efforts to achieve it.

Barely five months ago, in the General Assembly, we analysed the state of implementation of the Millennium Development Goals. Regrettably, it had to be recognized that only one third of them had been achieved. With little more than half of what the major Powers currently allocate to military expenditures, the Millennium Development Goals could be met and international peace and security strengthened.

Hence the importance of today's Security Council debate, which must contribute to creating awareness of that reality. Economic and social development must be at the centre of United Nations priorities and cannot continue to be neglected. This Organization must develop urgent measures that redress the inequalities that persist in international economic relations. To that end, there is a need for complete and structural reform

of the global financial and economic architecture. Speeches and promises are not enough. Political will is needed.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mrs. Morgan Sotomayor (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): We thank Ambassador Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil, and his delegation for the initiative of organizing this debate, which seems to us extremely timely.

The change in the nature of conflicts and the increase in threats to international peace and security have compelled the Organization, especially the Security Council, to adapt to those new challenges that transcend borders and affect the security both of people and of States.

We are convinced that development, security and human rights go hand in hand and are mutually strengthened. While it cannot be stated that lack of development and the denial of human rights are the only cause of conflicts and instability, those factors significantly increase the tendency for violence.

That is why it is important to keep strengthening the Organization's capacity not only for establishing and maintaining peace but also for preventive diplomacy and peacebuilding, in which development plays a key role. The Security Council should bear in mind the need to attend to the security of the people, and not just of the nation, and the importance of emphasizing security based on human development rather than on weaponry.

International peace and security must be approached with a comprehensive focus that addresses the structural causes of conflicts, such as the lack of development opportunities. The increasing number of peacekeeping operations with multidimensional mandates, which include such diverse areas as humanitarian assistance, strengthening the rule of law, security sector reform and promoting development, confirms the importance that this comprehensive vision has acquired in Security Council decisions.

As a member of the Security Council in 2002-2003 and 2009-2010, Mexico sought to strengthen the effectiveness of the Council's decisions and capabilities, with the aim of addressing the structural causes of conflicts through the growing inclusion of the link between security, development and human rights in its mandates and resolutions. My delegation is convinced that the Security Council should continue to work on the prevention of conflicts and to facilitate timely responses to emerging crises — areas in which development plays a determining role. To that end, the Council should continue to promote measures to tackle the structural causes of conflicts, which would include the promotion of development, the protection of human rights, disarmament and strengthening the rule of law, as well as encouraging more effective partnerships among the various relevant actors internationally, including regional and subregional organizations, civil society and financial institutions.

Cooperation between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, and the inclusion of their input into peacekeeping operations mandates are essential to the success of that strategy, bearing in mind the fact that development depends fundamentally on the national decisions of each State. For this reason, we have stressed the importance of closely tying peacebuilding to the national priorities of each country.

We have witnessed on many occasions the impact that a lack of development opportunities can have on the stability of a country or a region. This confirms once again the fact that development, respect for human rights and security are mutually reinforcing. The Security Council cannot distance itself from that fact.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Uganda.

Mr. Lukwiya (Uganda): I thank you, Madame, for organizing this debate on a theme that is very important to us. I also thank the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Rwanda, and the Special Representative of the World Bank for their statements this morning. We also welcome the participation of several Ministers of Foreign Affairs in this debate.

Uganda welcomes the increasing attention that the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole, as well as regional organizations and the wider international community, are paying to the interdependence between security and development. This has, of course, been a gradual process, beginning with the United Nations agendas for peace and development in the 1990s, which recognized the need to address peace, security and development through integrated approaches.

As has already been emphasized by many speakers before me, there is no doubt that security is a prerequisite for development; without peace development is not possible. Without development, peace and security are not sustainable; the two are therefore mutually reinforcing. The *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development* highlights the fact that conflict and insecurity are major challenges and impediments to economic development. The World Bank's focus on this theme is pertinent. Evidence abounds that fragile countries and those in conflict or in post-conflict situations lag behind in almost all development indicators, including the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

Durable peace, security and development can be achieved only through a comprehensive approach that integrates the security, economic, social and humanitarian dimensions. It is essential to take into account a people-centred view of security, which is necessary for national, regional and global stability. The United Nations and the wider international community should intensify their efforts towards a more effective and coherent approach to peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding. In this regard, the Peacebuilding Commission is already playing a very important role in supporting countries emerging from conflict. More emphasis should be placed on delivering tangible dividends, including the provision of basic services, employment opportunities, and the improvement of the people's standard of living.

Finally, fundamental reform of the current international architecture for peace, security and development is urgent and necessary to ensure greater representation and participation, especially on the part of developing countries.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Luxembourg.

Ms. Lucas (Luxembourg) (*spoke in French*): Allow me to congratulate you, Madame, on your initiative in organizing this open debate, which usefully complements previous debates on the conditions necessary to a sustainable end to conflicts and the genuine rebuilding of the countries on the Council's agenda.

Luxembourg fully aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union.

> "There will be no development without security and no security without development. And both development and security also depend on respect for human rights and the rule of law." (*A/59/2005, annex, para. 2*)

That principle, enunciated in the 2005 report "In larger freedom", is the cornerstone of Luxembourg's commitment to an effective multilateral system with the United Nations at its heart, and it is with that fundamental interdependence in mind that Luxembourg supports the processes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and security sector reform, as well as early recovery, socio-economic development and the establishment of the rule of law.

Since 2000, Luxembourg has been among the countries that respect the goal of allocating 0.7 per cent of their gross national income to official development assistance (ODA), as noted by the representative of Cuba. Our ODA has exceeded 1 per cent since 2009. Our engagement is committed to the eradication of poverty and the realization of the Millennium Development Goals, including as a long-term investment for peace and security and with a view to preventing the outbreak of new conflict.

Luxembourg's development cooperation also implements programmes that bring a security perspective directly to the development approach. For example in northern Mali, in the region of Kidal, we support a sustainable development programme aimed at reducing the local population's poverty by improving access to basic social services and job opportunities, and at reinforcing the leadership of the Mali administration in the development of the region. In parallel, and in partnership with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes, Luxembourg supports the Government of Mali's efforts to fight illicit trafficking and organized crime in that region, which is heavily affected by the presence of Al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb.

As you indicated in your concept note (S/2011/50), Madame President, the Security Council should not take on the responsibilities of other principal organs and agencies. But if the Council wants to define sustainable strategies to end conflict, it is vital that it consider the analyses and efforts of development organs and actors and strive to coordinate well with those actors. The establishment of sustainable security and stability requires a tangible development perspective.

Peacebuilding is the key stage between the establishment of security and the socio-economic relaunching of a country. Peacekeepers themselves are early peacebuilders. Their presence should create a security environment conducive to the deployment of reconstruction and development activities. We encourage the Council to enhance its relationship with the Peacebuilding Commission so that it can systematically seek the Commission's advice when it is about to renew the mandate of a peacekeeping operation, including with respect to countries that are not on the agenda of the Commission. In that regard, we welcome the recent interactive dialogues with the Chairs of the Liberia and Burundi configurations and the active engagement of the Chair of the Commission's Organizational Committee and the Chairs of the five country-specific configurations in today's debate.

Convinced of the fundamental importance of an integrated approach, Luxembourg has been actively engaged in post-conflict peacebuilding since the inception of the United Nations peacebuilding architecture.

The adoption of any type of security approach to a conflict must be preceded by a thorough analysis of its root causes. In that way, efforts can be made in close coordination with all stakeholders, including women, to enable a country to emerge from crisis and foster its development. In that context, we must not fail to include the management of a country's natural resources or issues related to land rights. In that regard, the Council should draw on all expertise available within the United Nations system. It is essential that the Council receive reports of the Secretary-General that take into account the points of view and analyses of all relevant departments on a given conflict or theme.

Among the principal organs of the United Nations, the Economic and Social Council is ideally positioned to provide a socio-economic development perspective to the Security Council's discussions preceding the definition of a peacekeeping mandate. Closer cooperation between the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission can in turn reinforce the coherent action of the United Nations system so as to foster the sustainable development of countries emerging from conflict. That is why Luxembourg, during its Presidency of the Economic and Social Council in 2009, took the initiative of convening the first joint meeting between the Council and the Peacebuilding Commission, held on the topic of food and economic crises in countries emerging from conflict.

Allow me to conclude with a few comments on climate security. In our view, the adverse impacts of climate change have clear repercussions on the security and development of many States, in particular small island developing States. At the very least, we should think of climate change as a threat multiplier, as the Secretary-General notes in his report on climate change and its possible security implications (A/64/350), pursuant to General Assembly resolution 63/281 of 2009. We therefore encourage the Security Council to further pursue the discussions it began in 2007 on this important issue.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank you, Madame President, for convening this open debate and for your very lucid concept note (S/2011/50), as circulated by your Mission.

The complex links between security and development are quite obvious, even at the intuitive or common-sense level. Over the years, these links have been codified and clarified in numerous internal and academic studies, from Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali's 1992 Agenda for Peace (S/24111) to the forthcoming *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development*, which was introduced here this morning by the Special Representative of the World Bank, in addition to the various reports mentioned in the concept note.

We nevertheless continue to draw lessons from every peacekeeping and peacebuilding operation, precisely because each has its own unique characteristics, from country to country, from region to region within the same country, or even within a single region or country, but at different moments in time. I will not even attempt to add insights to the conceptual elements that link security development. I will instead allude to my own country, which experienced internal armed conflict for more than three decades that ended only in 1996.

I would like to make three brief comments. First, and as stated in the concept note, poverty and injustice alone do not necessarily lead to violence and conflict. If

that were the case, conflict would have erupted in my country much earlier, since poverty and exclusion alike were the rule, rather than the exception, for decades and even centuries. What prevailed during most of that period was a history of poverty and injustice that created much frustration and resentment — a proverbial powder keg — that had the potential to explode if mixed with other factors. In the case of the conflicts in Central America, including Guatemala, the detonator was supplied by an external source, subjecting our rather parochial differences to an East-West confrontation in the context of the so-called Cold War. That greatly polarized our society along divisive ideological lines that were superimposed over the traditional cleavage that separated the rich from the poor.

The spiral of violence stemming from that polarization was not the product of poverty and injustice alone, but their presence most certainly added fuel to the fire. Attention should therefore really be paid to both the underlying circumstances and the other complex factors that can trigger conflict.

As I said before, it is common sense that, where there are high levels of unemployment, especially among young people, and a high incidence of poverty coexisting with first-world standards of living enjoyed by a minority, at least some of the elements of potential conflict are present. Those must be addressed, not only for intrinsic and ethical reasons, but also, in the broader context, as a conflict prevention measure.

Secondly, almost the same arguments can be made, at least in the case of Guatemala, for promoting the rule of law and strengthening democratic institutions. I do not have the time to expand on the matter, so I will limit my comments to noting that the worst-case scenario is one in which accumulated frustrations are not addressed in any concrete way, and are not even allowed to be expressed openly to influence public policy responses. We had a long, sad record of repression and a culture of impunity, which we are combating even today with the help of the United Nations. The main point is that any serious examination of the links between security and development has to include the matter of institution-building and the strengthening of the rule of law.

Finally, it is quite clear that one pillar of the United Nations — the maintenance of peace in countries emerging from conflict — can be maintained only if solid foundations are laid for sustainable peace and development. The United Nations cannot approach peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding in a piecemeal manner, so we are pleased to note the innovations introduced since 2005 in creating what is now called the peacebuilding architecture. It is our hope that last year's review of the peacebuilding architecture will lead to greater clarity regarding the role of each of the principal organs and the Peacebuilding Commission so that sustainable peace and development can be addressed in an integrated and coordinated manner system-wide.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt): At the outset, I would like to express, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), our appreciation to Brazil for convening this debate, emphasizing the relationship between successful sustainable development and the preservation of peace as the cornerstone of security and stability. We thank the Secretary-General, the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), and the Special Representative of the World Bank for their comprehensive briefings.

In a world of interconnected challenges and opportunities, it is difficult to dismiss the conceptual relation between security and development. Both are concerned with people; both impact and influence one another. The absence of security makes it difficult for development to thrive, while the lack of broad-based development may trigger instability and pose a challenge in the long run to security and sustainable peace. Yet on the practical level, the connection between security and development remains elusive, and its implications are hard to define and should be thoroughly examined in the proper forums.

Even though we welcome today's debate as a contribution to enhancing the understanding of the interlinkages between security and development, it is important to stress that this issue goes beyond the core competencies of the Security Council. The Security Council's primary responsibility, under the Charter of the United Nations, is for the maintenance of international peace and security. It has no authority over United Nations development agencies, funds or programmes. Issues pertaining to economic and social development fall within the competence of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. As Member States, we all must respect this distinction,

even as we encourage close coordination and cooperation among the principal organs of the United Nations, which is essential to enabling the United Nations to successfully address the nexus between peace and security, on the one hand, and development on the other.

Although recent reports of the Secretary-General to the Council show that new and emerging issues — such as intra-State conflicts, organized crime, the illegal exploitation of natural resources, rapid urbanization and maritime security — have been gaining greater weight as challenges to international peace and security, particularly in Africa, the Non-Aligned Movement believes that a comprehensive approach to dealing with the root causes of conflicts needs to be adopted, in close coordination among the United Nations principal organs, the United Nations system, international financial institutions, regional organizations, national authorities and civil society, in order to combine and make use of the expertise and lessons learned by the relevant actors within their areas of competence and in accordance with their mandates.

Enhancing stability and sustainable development is key to the success of the international efforts to promote peace and development worldwide. The fact that many non-aligned countries, in particular in Africa, are not on track to meet the Millennium Development Goals by 2015 furthers the case for the need to implement all commitments related to supporting development, particularly in Africa, including the full implementation of the political declaration on "Africa's development needs: state of implementation of various commitments, challenges and the way forward" (resolution 63/1), adopted at the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on 22 September 2008, as well as all other commitments related to supporting developing countries' endeavours to achieve sustainable development.

NAM believes that United Nations peacekeeping operations are at a crucial juncture as a result of the increased demand for and the expansion and complexity of their tasks and mandates, as well as the Organization's increasing responsibilities beyond the nature of its political role and its ability to implement them. All these factors, along with the absence of political settlement of many conflicts, increase the burdens on the capacity of the Organization and troop- and police-contributing countries.

The Non-Aligned Movement is of the view that this situation requires the Organization to continue building on what has been achieved towards developing a common vision on how to proceed regarding the development of concepts, and to strengthen the partnership between the Member States and the Secretariat in order for United Nations peacekeeping operations to gain the political, financial and logistical support needed, in accordance with a vision that realizes the needs and available capacities and in a manner that enhances the United Nations role in maintaining international peace and security.

Accordingly, the Non-Aligned Movement re-emphasizes its commitment to supporting all efforts aimed at achieving the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations, and reiterates the following.

First, it is important to achieve consensus among Member States on the development of peacekeeping policies, and not to seek to implement ideas and approaches that have not been approved by Member States.

Secondly, all necessary support, financial and human resources, and military and civilian capabilities must be provided to peacekeeping missions so that they can fulfil their tasks within a framework of full respect for the host country, its laws and norms, and achieve their common goals. In this context, it is necessary to avoid changing the tasks of peacekeeping missions without previous consultations with troop-contributing countries or obtaining their consent for any change.

Thirdly, more attention must be paid to exit strategies through increased efforts to settle disputes peacefully as the main goal of the strategy, and with a view to dealing effectively with the increased demands of some States for the early exit of peacekeeping missions, and to paving the way for peacebuilders and development actors to support and consolidate the newly established peace through socio-economic development and efficient institution- and capacity-building on the basis of full respect of national ownership.

In addition, the Non-Aligned Movement is of the view that post-conflict peacebuilding activities should be conducted through intense and effective consultations among the principal organs of the United Nations, giving due emphasis on their respective areas of competence.

The three-tiered nexus of peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development merits very careful comprehensive consideration by the appropriate organs of the United Nations in order to further sustain the needed resources for all three processes, and with a view to strengthening, within a framework of national ownership, the national capacities of Governments in post-conflict countries to rise to their duties and responsibilities, thus empowering national Governments with the prerequisites for assuming their responsibilities in the security, defence, political, social and economic sectors, and engage in a sustainable development process supported by sufficient financial resources, technical expertise and institutional skills. In addition, the provision of adequate and timely resources will be indispensable.

Furthermore, the PBC must examine integrated peacebuilding strategies for post-conflict countries to ensure that they gradually incorporate a comprehensive sustainable development component that addresses emerging socio-economic challenges from the early stages of implementation by national authorities, in cooperation with the Peacebuilding Commission and the relevant United Nations, international and regional actors.

Consequently, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council must give due consideration to the overlap between the peacebuilding process and the launch of a sustainable development framework in post-conflict countries. Efforts to establish the foundations for good governance, the rule of law and the application of the principles of democracy and justice will not realize their full potential in communities plagued by poverty, disease, hunger and a continued lack of basic living standards.

The PBC must be actively involved in the formulation of early peacebuilding components within peacekeeping operations on a case-by-case basis, where the Commission should conduct an appropriate evaluation of the needs and requirements for such a component, in full coordination with the country concerned. The PBC can enrich Security Council debates on post-conflict situations by sharing its views and expertise of relevance to peacebuilding and early development processes. Furthermore, without prejudice to the functions and powers of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council must also play a leading role in the formulation and implementation of peacebuilding and development activities.

The Non-Aligned Movement will continue to support all United Nations efforts in all fields, including peace, security and development, and stands ready to engage constructively in any further discussions in the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council on that important issue.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Kazakhstan.

Mrs. Altimova (Kazakhstan): I thank the Brazilian presidency for convening this open debate on the very important subject of the interdependence between security and development. I would also like to express my appreciation to Sarah Cliffe of the World Bank for the Bank's insightful 2011 *World Development Report*, as well as to the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission for his briefing. The thoughtful statement by the Secretary-General, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, indicates that, today, the United Nations works in a radically different world with new realities.

We know too well that the greatest security threats facing us today, and in the decades ahead, go far beyond States waging aggressive war or being embroiled in their own internal violence. They extend to political, economic and social exclusion and unrest — caused by gross poverty, a severe shortage of food and water, infectious diseases and environmental degradation — the spread and possible use of weapons of mass destruction; terrorism; transnational organized crime and mass flows of refugees and internally displaced persons. Threats recognize no national boundaries, are interconnected and must be addressed at the global, regional and national levels.

The central challenge for us now is to fashion a broader understanding of security, with its accompanying responsibilities, strategies, institutions and systems that not only establish stability and the rule of law but also foster social and economic development, with the right of people to self-determination. The principles of freedom from want and fear and the freedom to live with dignity, with respect for human rights, are fundamental, as they reinforce each other and are interconnected. They guide the processes of preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping, humanitarian action, peacebuilding, post-conflict recovery and development, and especially the achievement of the Millennium

Development Goals. We must constantly refine those tools for each theatre of operation, because each will have its specific situation, as well as collectively for the Security Council's strategy with regard to the rules of engagement of peacekeeping operations and their exit strategies, and for the steps taken for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration through multidisciplinary and multi-tiered actions. Measures must be taken for institution- and capacity-building and the provision of services to promote internal stability.

It is therefore obvious that the Council must pay attention to the resolutions of the General Assembly and its six Committees on relevant security issues. Likewise, the decisions of the Economic and Social Council, which drives forward the agenda emerging from global summits, coordinates the activities of specialized United Nations agencies, consults non-governmental organizations and networks with regional commissions, provide early warning signals. The Human Rights Council provides the indicators for human rights in specific conflict situations. The Peacebuilding Commission offers guidance on gaps that threaten to undermine peace in post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery. The United Nations humanitarian response system and governance of the global environment, each with their ever-growing range and scale of demands, are uniquely positioned to monitor global security issues and to advise a shift to stable development, which includes the participation of women and youth.

The Council must recognize that among the key contributors to peace and prosperity are strong leadership, popular legitimacy and policy approaches, which can successfully integrate security, justice, will and opportunities for economic advancement. Thus, short-, medium- and long-term confidence-building in the political, development and social spheres and the delivery of concrete results on the ground in decentralized locations become imperative. My country's creation of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia is an excellent example of regional cooperation, and testifies to how time-consuming and difficult such a process is, but also to the fact that strong political will can make confidence-building possible and, thus, conflict prevention.

Conflict and fragility, and their nexus with development, entail more cooperation than hitherto with financial institutions — such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and regional banks — as well as with regional structures, such as the African Union, the New Partnership for Africa's Development and the European Union, together with a wide variety of other actors at the global, regional, national and local levels. Youth are an important segment of such a multi-stakeholder arrangement of academia, religious leaders, human rights actors, grassroots organizations and independent media. Their engagement is critical for early intervention to avoid radicalization. While the Council and peacekeeping operations have limited mandates, they can amply benefit from the United Nations system, which directly addresses development issues and interacts with significant players that perform watchdog functions.

In closing, I would like to affirm Kazakhstan's support for the United Nations in promoting peace in numerous ways, in particular the closure of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site in 1991, the establishment of the Central Asian nuclear weapon-free-zone in 1996 and the generation of collective thinking by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Organization of the Islamic Conference on peace, security and sustainable development issues. My country also assists the recovery process of countries in the region affected by war and conflicts. It is essential that the Council review the constantly evolving international security environment and its implications for the United Nations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Peru.

Mr. Rodríguez Arailas (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation very much welcomes this debate, for which we thank the presidency. This is an opportunity to consider a timely and important issue. As a member of the Peacebuilding Commission and as an active participant in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, Peru is committed to lending its support in connection with this topic. I should also like to express our gratitude for the concept paper (S/2011/50), which provides us with the basis for our discussion today.

Peru associates itself with the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

On repeated occasions, Peru has highlighted the importance of complementarity and synergy between

security, development, human rights and humanitarian assistance efforts. That entails interlinked and inseparable elements that should serve to guide the development of comprehensive peacekeeping and peacebuilding strategies. They should also necessarily be reflected on the ground, if indeed our goal is international peace and security — which is the primary responsibility of this main organ of the United Nations.

Just a few days ago in Munich, the Secretary-General, in referring to the events in the Middle East, also spoke of the indispensable link between peace and security, two concepts that cannot exist one without the other. There is much experience to attest to this, including many current cases that pose a challenge to the Council and the Organization. I should also point out that our experience throughout history also shows that in such cases there is also the opposing link between violence, institutional fragility, insecurity and the re-emergence of conflict.

As the experience of the United Nations has shown, there is an increasingly urgent need for a comprehensive approach to security, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. That requires an analysis of the underlying causes of violence and the socio-economic situation on the ground. It also requires parting with hermetic and compartmentalized approaches and strategies to conflict and post-conflict situations. That is to say, we need a synergistic and complementary approach to efforts at preventive diplomacy, the emergence and re-emergence of conflicts and support for conflict resolution, peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts.

Given that peacekeeping operations constitute one of the Organization's most important tools in preserving peace and security, we must ask the question of whether such operations can or should be involved in development efforts, and up to what point. In his report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (A/64/573), the Secretary-General points out that peacekeeping operations typically play three functions.

The first is to coordinate and provide support for consensus among national actors and the international community; the second is to act as facilitator with other actors in carrying out peacebuilding activities while providing security and supporting socio-economic reconstruction; and the third, which pertains to peacebuilding functions, entails laying the groundwork for stability and establishing the capacities for the development of institutions. As we discussed here in the Council last month, the latter is essential in moving towards development and sustainable peace. Those functions, which are evident in current peacekeeping efforts, illustrate that peacekeeping missions can indeed integrate the security and development dimensions, whether through activities aimed at peacekeeping, early peacebuilding or peacebuilding itself.

In developing an integrated strategy, we should underscore the role played by the Peacebuilding Commission as an advisory and catalyzing body for an approach focused on the interdependence between security and development that is formulated to address the specific needs of each situation and the national priorities that serve to establish and strengthen national capacity. It is essential to strengthen the capacities of the Peacebuilding Commission, thereby contributing to the swift and effective implementation of the recommendations made in connection with its review. The Commission is one of the principal and most appropriate bodies for reaffirming the participation of the United Nations in peace processes in order to generate the necessary atmosphere of security and trust for a process of inclusive national ownership.

In conclusion, I should like to return to the theme of our debate today. It is undoubtedly clear that the security and development components should guide the mandates of peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations. The strategies and actions of every United Nations agency should also come directly into play in the implementation of development efforts. There is therefore a need for close and effective coordination with all those agencies, including the involvement of the entire membership to ensure that coordination. In other words, this is a shared responsibility. Peru is fully aware of it and we are committed to meeting it.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Fiji.

Mr. Thomson (Fiji): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS) represented at the United Nations, namely, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Tonga, Vanuatu and my own country,

Fiji. I wish to start by thanking Brazil, as President of the Security Council, for convening this open debate. The Pacific SIDS have long understood that peace, security and development go hand in hand. I am therefore glad for the opportunity to add our voice to this important discussion.

Small island developing States like those in the Pacific that have experienced violent conflict know first hand the interdependence of security and development. Accelerated sustainable economic development activities such as focused investment to create jobs, building and maintaining critical infrastructure and addressing environmental degradation help to prevent a relapse into conflict, and are the only way to guarantee long-term sustainable peace. Such development, along with security, is integral to peacebuilding activities.

More generally, development provides countries with increased resilience to, and greater capacity to cope with, political, economic and environmental shocks to the State. The Pacific SIDS cannot effectively cope with global shocks owing to their particular vulnerabilities, including unique geographies and the lack of both technical capacity and large diversified economies. Global unsustainable development impacts can also weaken resilience to external shocks and threaten security. For example, global unsustainable fishing practices in Pacific waters severely undermines food security in our region. In that regard, we welcome the General Assembly's adoption of resolution 65/150, on the protection of coral reefs for sustainable livelihoods — a resolution that all Pacific countries promoted. We look forward to these important issues being addressed next year at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro.

For the Pacific SIDS, the adverse impacts of climate change pose the greatest shock risk and the most imminent threat to our development and security. Rising waters, more intense storms, global and local food shortages and freshwater scarcity endanger many of our islands. The report of the Secretary-General on climate change and its possible security implications (A/64/350) calls climate change a threat-multiplier. This is true. But climate change is also a threat in and of itself, creating instability where none before existed.

Based on projections of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees deems it very likely that rising sea levels and increasing extreme weather events will cause low-lying island States like some of the Pacific SIDS to be entirely uninhabitable long before their full submersion. The resulting and inevitable displacement from these island States can lead to serious security problems for the displaced peoples as well as the receiving community. For some Pacific island States, climate impacts, especially sea level rise, may even threaten and call into question current conceptions of sovereignty. This issue is unprecedented and demands the specific attention of the Council.

At the same time, climate change undermines our economic development by demanding an ever-increasing share of our financial resources to adapt to its negative impacts. There is an urgent need to increase efforts to improve the development prospects of vulnerable countries in order to safeguard their resilience to the impacts of climate change, as well as the need to fund urgent adaptation projects. This must go hand in hand with global efforts to rapidly reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Past emissions have already committed us to dangerous levels of temperature increase, and the world is at great risk of non-linear and destabilizing impacts that threaten global peace and security.

To mitigate the prospects of conflict and insecurity, the Security Council must urgently address the security implications of climate change. In 2009, the General Assembly unanimously adopted resolution 63/281, which called on all relevant organs of the United Nations to intensify their efforts in considering and addressing climate change, including its possible security implications. As the United Nations body holding primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council is duty bound to substantively address this issue. We reiterate our call on the Security Council to urgently begin consideration of the threats to international peace and security posed by climate change, and to consider actions it could take to respond to these growing threats.

As the Secretary-General highlighted this morning, we must focus more on the climate change-security-development nexus and on the fact that managing climate risks is necessary to achieving security.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): The 2005 World Summit Outcome (General Assembly resolution 60/1) underscored the importance of interlinkages between development, peace and security, and human rights, and of their mutual reinforcement. The urgent need to do everything possible to carry out the vision presented in the Millennium Declaration (General Assembly resolution 55/2) is now more evident than ever. We therefore welcome the initiative of the presidency of the Security Council to place this issue on today's agenda.

Given the late hour and the long list of speakers, my statement will be extremely brief and limited to two points. For our other substantive arguments, I invite the Security Council to refer to the statement made by my colleague, the Permanent Representative of Belgium, on behalf of the five Chairs of the country-specific configurations of the Peacebuilding Commission. We fully associate ourselves with that statement.

First, lasting peace and development cannot be achieved in any society without the promotion of human rights and justice. The reform processes of the United Nations relating to peace and security, operational development systems and human rights must be implemented in a coordinated manner. The Security Council could function more efficiently if it were able to benefit from a more comprehensive analysis of the situations it monitors, in particular of the root causes of conflicts, taking account of the socio-economic and environmental dimensions and other factors that threaten peace and security.

Secondly, strategic cooperation between the United Nations and the World Bank is essential. In this regard, the World Bank's *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development* comes at an opportune time. Periodic exchanges with development players and those involved in the peacebuilding architecture could be more effective if they were systematized and intensified. I am thinking of processes such as the preparation of reports of the Secretary-General, mission planning, continuing education for personnel and within integrated mission task forces. For the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission, the importance of such cooperation no longer needs to be proven, and we are pleased to be able to actively participate in it with regard to Burundi.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Loulichki (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): The ongoing and concrete commitment of your country, Madame President, to peacebuilding and development underlies the wise choice by your presidency of the topic of today's debate. It is a welcome coincidence that this debate complements that convened by the presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina last month, which we welcome. It allows us to undertake in-depth consideration and to act together to develop a truly integrated approach of the Security Council in addressing conflicts.

The persistence of conflicts, their human and financial costs, and the imperatives of stability in the post-conflict phase require early interaction between the peacekeeping and peacebuilding phases. The establishment of lasting peace demands judicious management of the critical transition between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. That transitional phase must be addressed through an approach that allies security imperatives with development activities to stabilize a State emerging from conflict. This critical phase must be approached with a keen awareness of the high risk of relapse into conflict.

Interlinkages between security and development are complex, and the transition to peacebuilding must be managed cautiously in an international environment characterized by the growing collusion among transnational criminal gangs, non-State actors and shadowy terror networks working together to weaken States, as they do in the Sahel-Sahara region.

The United Nations post-conflict presence must help to develop national strategies targeting such key priorities as the promotion of women's rights, youth employment, the protection of vulnerable social groups, the establishment of the rule of law and the strengthening of State institutions. It is vital in that vast undertaking that the United Nations efforts be effectively coordinated so as to mesh the establishment of peace, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development in a coherent manner. The Peacebuilding Commission has a key role to play in that context.

It is essential that the international community strengthen the capacities of the host State to reduce

poverty, economic recovery and provide basic services. Practice has amply demonstrated the critical importance of national ownership of peacebuilding. The leadership role of the host State faces challenges, but it is essential in that it allows for a better articulation of a national recovery strategy that combines all dimensions of peace, security and development. In that regard, it is important to promote the necessary synergy and coordination among national and international structures and to mobilize sustained resources.

The United Nations must strengthen its capacities to define integrated strategies from the outset and to coordinate the activities of the various stakeholders on the ground responsible both for security and for development. This will contribute to making the international community's actions more coherent and coordinated. Moreover, the international economic assistance provided by bilateral donors and international financial institutions must target projects that take account of a given country's economic, social and even cultural realities, its particular capacities and the prospects it offers to foreign investors. In that respect, our active policy is to support peacebuilding in many African countries, targeting multiplier sectors that contribute to human development, such as education, safe drinking water and electrification in rural areas.

Above and beyond the efforts of the United Nations and the international community to establish, maintain and build peace, their role in the peaceful settlement of disputes and conflict prevention remains critical and must be developed, strengthened and adequately endowed with financial and human resources in the interests of peace and international security.

The President: I give the floor to Mr. Pedro Serrano, Acting Head of the delegation of the European Union to the United Nations.

Mr. Serrano: Let me start by thanking Brazil for organizing today's debate on the interdependence between security and development. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his statement and Ms. Sarah Cliffe of the World Bank for her remarks on the *World Development Report*, which we look forward to. I also thank all of the speakers who have addressed the Council today.

The candidate countries of Turkey, Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and the European Free Trade Association country of Liechtenstein, member of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, align themselves with this declaration.

I would like to approach the complex interrelationship between security and development from three angles: first, security as a precondition for development; secondly, development as a precondition for security; and, finally, respect for human rights as a precondition for both security and development.

In the short run, security is a precondition for development. In more than half of the post-conflict countries conflict flares up again within five years after a peace agreement and destroys any hope of development. Peacekeeping missions can help keep violence at bay, especially if they are multidimensional and join forces with other United Nations actors through an integrated strategic framework while taking into account the need to ensure the impartiality, neutrality and independence of the humanitarian entities.

The European Union remains committed to further improving the performance of these missions, both from New York and in the field. In New York, we remain a staunch supporter of, and an active contributor to, the Peacebuilding Commission, which can provide peacebuilding counsel to the Security Council — for example, on how to tie the activities of its missions into the wider peacebuilding effort in a country. In addition, the European Union looks forward to a strategy for critical early peacebuilding tasks undertaken by peacekeepers that features joint United Nations planning and a clear United Nations division of labour based on competence, track records and ability to deliver. Also here in New York, we look forward to a results-oriented Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations that makes headway with an effective strategic framework for the protection of civilians and with the constructive dialogue on a robust approach to peacekeeping, among other things.

In the field, aside from our own 13 political, civilian and military missions, we make financial

resources available for projects to buttress United Nations peacekeeping missions. This has, for example, helped the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti with the development of justice and police manuals; the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur with the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad with the training of police in Chad; and the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste with capacity-building in the security sector. All those are crucial steps towards making those countries safe for development.

In the long run, development is a precondition for security. Many of the poorest countries are also the most fragile ones, and each percentage point more growth means a percentage point less of a risk of civil war. We need to work on long-term solutions, mainstreaming conflict prevention into our development policies. We need to work on sustainable development, food security and on addressing all the root causes of conflict. That is what the European Union is doing.

Poverty eradication is at the heart of the Treaty of Lisbon. More than 50 per cent of the money spent to help developing countries comes from the European Union and its member States, making it the world's biggest aid donor. The Millennium Development Goals serve as one beacon of our aid policy, and national ownership serves as another. Of course, national actors can only take charge if they have the capacity to manage the myriad relationships with the international community. That is why the European Union has decided to help the Peacebuilding Support Office put together a special database, which can serve as the basis for developing national aid-information management systems.

Human rights is the third pillar of our world Organization. Both in the short and in the long run, respect for all human rights and for the rule of law, apart from an end in itself, is also a precondition for both security and development. Security without respect for human rights and the rule of law is not security. There can be no human development without human rights. As the United Nations Development Group's most recent report on human rights mainstreaming argued, respect for human rights helps reduce inequality and discrimination, which often underlie development problems.

The European Union strongly backs the mainstreaming of human rights, including gender equality, in the work of the United Nations — for example, through the recently established mainstreaming mechanism of the Development Group. More frequent presentations by the High Commissioner for Human Rights at the Security Council would be a good way to further mainstream human rights in its work. The European Union supports the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in its efforts to integrate human rights into all components of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Let me conclude by saluting the adoption of today's presidential statement (S/PRST/2011/4), which builds on an already important doctrine on this issue, including the 2005 World Summit Outcome and the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development. The European Union looks forward to further following up such declarations on the interdependence between security, development and human rights, translating them into international action.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Chile.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to thank the delegation of Brazil for its decision to convene this important debate focused on the interdependence between international security and development in the search for sustainable peace in the world. I should also like to express my thanks to the Secretary-General for his important briefing this morning; Mr. Eugène-Richard Gasana, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, for his valuable contribution to this debate; and Ms. Sarah Cliffe of the World Bank, for her clear and substantiated statement.

Chile associates itself with the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Thailand on behalf of the Human Security Network, to which we belong.

The long experience of the United Nations in the prevention and resolution of conflicts shows us that the issue of development — or, rather, the lack thereof — is at the source of many of the conflicts that have been on the agenda of the Security Council. Security imposed by peacekeeping operations carries no guarantee that security will be sustained or that conflict

will not eventually re-emerge. In order to avoid that there is a need for several factors to come together: security, the strengthening of the rule of law, respect for and promotion of human rights, the empowerment of women and the establishment of conditions that foster development. That is the only way to achieve sustainable peace.

In that regard, the issue of development and a country's social conditions — whether with regard to the levels of unemployment, hunger or poverty — and the way we address those challenges are issues that should be taken into account and assessed by the Council when it authorizes mandates for peacekeeping operations. We agree with today's presidential statement that

> "reconstruction, economic revitalization and capacity-building constitute crucial elements for the long-term development of post-conflict societies and in generating sustainable peace". (S/PRST/2011/4)

That is especially true in today's world, where the vast majority of crises that affect international peace and security have to do with internal conflicts and civil wars. In such cases, underdevelopment, poverty, unemployment and social marginalization pose underlying challenges to a State's governance, stability and unity. The Council cannot ignore those aspects in adopting informed decisions in the search for sustainable peace.

In that connection, it seems to us essential to point out that adequately addressing the interrelationship between security and development entails an effort in coordination and coherence of the actions of each United Nations body. This is not about bringing development issues to the Security Council, as the Council's work can take up the perspectives on development that can be provided by the Economic and Social Council, the General Assembly, the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and other relevant bodies, funds and programmes of the United Nations and pertinent regional entities.

In the 2005 Summit Outcome, heads of State and Government recognized the need to establish the Peacebuilding Commission in order to help post-conflict States by providing a comprehensive perspective. With regard to the recommendations of the co-facilitators of the 2010 Peacebuilding Commission review process, which have been approved in various Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, with a view to establishing and maintaining an informal and fluid dialogue between the Council and the Commission, my country believes that one concrete proposal could be to incorporate that dialogue into the Council's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. We know well that both peacekeeping and peacebuilding are two sides of the same coin. We are pleased that the presidential statement recognizes the need for coordination and dialogue with the Commission.

Finally, I wish to highlight two emblematic cases.

The first is Africa, which so many times has been an object of concern for this Council, and of sustained attention from Brazil. As recognized in the report of the Secretary-General on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development (S/1998/318), this is a region where the interrelationship between development and security is undeniable, and the Council must continue and deepen its efforts to include the factors of economic and social development that impact peace and security in the region.

Likewise, the case of Haiti is especially close to us — a sister nation confronting pressing challenges in its path to peace, political stability and economic and social development. In this case, my country also believes that, without neglecting the tasks of security, in a gradual and sustained manner, this Council is in an excellent position to help the United Nations system create appropriate conditions for the country's sustained and sustainable development, with full independence in the context of democracy and political stability and with strict adherence to the principle of national ownership that is suitable to the corresponding mandates so that, with an integrated focus, the required national capacities can be generated.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Botswana.

Mr. Ntwaagae (Botswana): On behalf of my delegation, I wish to thank the Brazilian presidency of the Council for convening the debate on this very pertinent subject regarding the interdependence between security and development.

My delegation believes that the foundation of peace and security is the establishment of a deliberate and sustained socio-economic development framework

for post-conflict zones. It is equally important to engender policy dialogue and to implement development projects and programmes in areas susceptible to conflict and instability. We also believe that security should be anchored in a firm foundation of political, social and economic infrastructure, both in areas that are both emerging from conflict and those that offer refuge.

It is pleasing to note that an increasing number of Member States are purposefully reorienting their foreign policy objectives and principles with a view to strengthening the contribution of development assistance in building relations.

The gradual demilitarization of foreign policy doctrines by a good number of Member States is also a welcome development that has a positive bearing on security and development. We continue to witness more and more resources being allocated to advancing the development agenda, establishing strong institutions of governance and the rule of law and promoting and protecting human rights. The elevation of development priorities to achieve parity with military spending is a commendable shift in policy and strategy that demonstrates the willingness of Member States to offer individual and collective responses to the global challenge of addressing the development deficit and threats of insecurity in many parts of the world.

The international community collectively possesses abundant resources and capability to lift humanity up from conditions of deprivation and underdevelopment. In that way, we would have avoided a more expensive route in favour of a more sustainable and effective approach to maintaining peace and security. Our bold initiatives in the area of conflict management will be in vain if the same level of commitment and resource mobilization is not replicated to meet one of the main goals enshrined in the Millennium Declaration, namely; the quest to lift over a billion people from poverty and hunger.

We should not allow the quest for technology and innovation to impede international cooperation and to further widen the gap between excesses on one hand and extreme poverty on the other. The opportunities presented by liberalized markets should result in their being accessible, as well as in increased trade and investment, which has so far only succeeded in giving some economies the security of development and growth more than others. That is the challenge of security we need to overcome.

The benefits accruing from globalization should account for our strongest partnership and interdependence in securing the future of all mankind. Investing in one another's sustainable development has the shared value of increasingly driving nations closer to each other, as opposed to alienating them from one another. We have to build a stronger and interdependent development community. That is the most sustainable way of eliminating conflict and insecurity.

At this juncture, let me commend the Peacebuilding Commission and the Department for Peacekeeping Operations for their hard work in the area of conflict prevention, monitoring and management, as well restoration of security and of law and order and the rebuilding and strengthening of institutions of governance.

My delegation believes that only the United Nations has the moral authority and the universal legitimacy to intervene in situations of instability that threaten to paralyze States. However, in order to bring a lasting solution to peace and security challenges, more emphasis should be given to the economic strategy that will be followed in the immediate aftermath of conflict. The art of mediation and conflict management should therefore always be accompanied by clear policy guidelines on resource mobilization and the establishment of long-term development priorities.

We are fully persuaded that development assistance is by far a much more meaningful and lasting response to the challenge of insecurity, simply because it brings results. It sustains countries and helps prevent their eventual collapse. It is also much more appreciated than fragmented aid because of its participatory nature. It generates security and goodwill even far beyond the domestic spheres of the State engulfed in conflict, and it is the ultimate in ensuring that the contagion effect of conflict is limited. The gains of development will undoubtedly set us on a good pedestal of achieving a secure and stable political environment.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Solomon Islands.

Mr. Beck (Solomon Islands): Madame President, thank you for organizing this timely open debate on the

interdependence between development and security. As pointed out in Brazil's concept paper (see S/2011/50), a series of similar discussions has taken place over the years. At this juncture, let me thank Brazil for that concept paper, which provides a number of reference documents but also poses thought-provoking questions.

A common thread that runs through all past discussions on the issue before us is the linkage between development and security. They are the two sides of the same coin. It is now an established fact that the Council, in discharging its role in the maintenance of international peace and security, will need to examine and address the root causes of conflict. Only by doing so can long-term sustainable peace be globally achieved. The Council, as advocated by the concept paper, must take due notice of actors in the other principal United Nations organs, in particular the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other subsidiary bodies, including the Peacebuilding Commission.

The linkage between development and security is best summed up by our 2005 Summit document (General Assembly resolution 60/1) and the report of the then Secretary-General, Kofi Annan (A/59/2005). The purpose of multilateralism is to provide our populations with freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to live in dignity. These populations include our youth, women and children and our rural communities.

As we look at the global environment, we see that the global financial markets have since improved. However, at environment remains fragile. External factors, depending on their health, shape and size, influence the level of instability and conflicts risk throughout the world.

The situation for Member states operating on the fringes of the international system is more brutal. These countries will need to be put on a special watch list with a dedicated development package. Countries with low income, low growth and dependence on natural resources and those vulnerable to climate change have a high conflict risk. Least developed countries and some small island developing States fall into this category. If not confronted decisively and meaningfully, climate change will determine our future. It is for these reasons that resolutions of the General Assembly have requested the Council to look at the security implications of non-action on global issues, including climate change. We therefore request the Council to be seized of this subject.

We still have the opportunity to enhance the maintenance of international peace and security. The climate change funds promised need to be released in a transparent manner through a United Nations multilateral body. The trust and confidence restored in Cancún remain fragile, and non-delivery threatens multilateralism. For the least developed countries, the Fourth United Nations Conference in May this year must deliver. We must break with business as usual; three 10-year programmes in the past three decades have not yielded the results we have been seeking. The Istanbul programme of action must be responsive to the development aspiration of least developed countries, allowing at least half to graduate from the group within the coming decade.

At all levels, the maintenance of international peace rests on the quality of development partnership, which must be balanced and strengthen national capacities with people-centred investment in the productive sectors. The Group of Seven Plus group of fragile countries led by Timor-Leste is seeking dividends of peace and quality, air-tight partnerships between partners and post-conflict least developed countries, and continues to add its support to this discussion. My delegation, with a watchful eye and hopeful spirit, looks forward to the outcome of this discussion, and once again thanks Brazil for its initiative and all Council's members for their support at this gathering.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania.

Mr. Sefue (United Republic of Tanzania): The United Republic of Tanzania appreciates your leadership, Madame, and decision to convene this open meeting. We welcome the statement of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, and we associate ourselves with the statement of the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission.

My delegation believes that the time has come for the subject of the interdependence of security and development to be on the regular agenda of the Security Council, for the world has changed significantly since 1945, when the Security Council was established. The nature and causes of conflict and instability have changed fundamentally. The threats to international peace and security that the Security

Council was confronted with at that time were significantly different from those it has to deal with today, most of them in Africa.

Today, a disproportionate share of the Security Council's time and the United Nations budget is devoted to peace and security issues in Africa. The foundations of enduring peace and security in Africa have to rest on development, good governance, participation and opportunity, both political and economic. Today, there is no doubt in our minds that deprivation, destitution and desperation, especially among young people, are veritable and imminent threats to peace and security within countries and globally. Crimes such as drug trafficking, piracy and terrorism, as well as illegal migration, have their roots in poverty.

Security is essential to development, and development is essential to security. The Security Council of today cannot ignore this nexus. Giving hope to the young people of Africa for a brighter future will help to reduce pressure on them to engage in activities that can lead to insecurity, instability, crime and conflict. For post-conflict societies, development and the peace dividend it provides are the best way to prevent relapse into conflict. People need to have a stake in peace, and shared development and prosperity are the best way to give them a stake in peace that will stabilize societies and create an environment conducive to good governance, respect for human rights and accountability.

Peacekeeping and protection measures, robust or otherwise, mandated by the Security Council can help to ensure peace between conflicting parties for limited periods of time. But we need to deal with the causes of conflicts, not only their manifestations; we need to develop capacities to prevent fires from breaking out, not only capacities to put out fires. This cannot happen without addressing development issues as an integral component of the architecture of peace and security in today's world. The Security Council needs to develop a strategy to embed development in this architecture. We are not asking the Security Council to exceed its mandate or to encroach on the territories of other agencies and programmes; we are only asking it to develop a strategy to be helpful to and supportive of the development work done by others.

Peacekeeping must not only end conflicts; it has to create space for sustainable development. It has to provide guarantees for the kind of peace and stability that are necessary for development to occur and economic opportunity to emerge. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding must be not an end, but part of a continuum of interventions needed to guarantee peace and security. Whereas the Peacebuilding Commission serves to bridge the gaps between security and development, the Security Council should ensure the interdependence of security and development by encouraging all actors and all countries to promote sustainable human development.

But each conflict is different in its genesis and evolution. We must not have a one-size-fits-all solution. The capacity of the United Nations to understand better the causes of each conflict in each context and to design a strategy geared to each needs to be improved. And certainly, in resource-rich conflict and post-conflict countries, the United Nations has to assist in ensuring that such resources provide a foundation and catalyst for development, not one for the self-enrichment of the few or for fuelling current or future conflicts.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Armenia.

Mr. Nazarian (Armenia): Allow me to join previous speakers in thanking the Brazilian Minister of External Relations for presiding over this important debate, and other Ministers for participating in our discussions. I would also like to express our gratitude to Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and the Special Representative of the World Bank for their contributions.

As has been noted before, there can be no development without security and no security without development. We believe that this debate will help to further galvanize and push forward two of our most critical common objectives — the achievement of lasting security and the realization of the Millennium Development Goals, which are so closely interlinked. We also believe that this is another important opportunity to bring together all international actors with development mandates in order for all of us to examine the progress made and the challenges ahead, to reflect on the evolution of our cooperation in the recent past, and to share our experiences for the benefit of our concerted efforts towards those goals.

As we take stock of the progress made in exploring the security-development nexus and related

policies, we welcome the positive initiatives that have been implemented in this arena. However, many challenges, conceptual and practical alike, remain. While we all agree that security and development are interdependent, we must recognize that in many ways each is also a very distinct goal with its own unique challenges and policy implications. Security and development are already very broad concepts that encompass a number of elements. The range of factors that can influence the interplay between security and development is vast. As such, context is important and narrowing our focus is critical to enabling us to come up with effective policies and solutions on a practical level.

The experience of international organizations dealing with conflict situations has demonstrated that lasting and sustainable peace will require a comprehensive package of solutions and an approach to security that takes into consideration both the root causes and the economic situation on the ground.

Today, the South Caucasus region continues to suffer from multiple challenges, and as a whole encounters great difficulties in making sufficient progress towards achieving regional security and development targets. Most important, the region is negatively impacted by the lack of full cooperation. Yet, we have not fully employed an essential resource that could bring us closer to peace, that is, sustainable development. One might question the value of embarking on such an effort in post-conflict situations where negotiations among the parties are ongoing. However, international experience has shown that economic cooperation and interaction can be a valuable confidence-building measure, often leading to political adhesion. Examples can be found in Western and Eastern Europe and, increasingly, in Asia.

The experience of the past two decades in the South Caucasus shows that the rejection of regional economic cooperation and the imposition of closed borders and blockades do not create political solutions; to the contrary, they alienate peoples in the surrounding region and destroy their trust and hope for lasting peace.

In order to achieve greater coherence in the region and expand the geographic area of cooperation, the South Caucasus needs to implement various initiatives and programmes sponsored by donor countries and organizations. In addition, international financial institutions, as well as private sector contributions, should to play a decisive role towards that end.

In that respect, Armenia shares the common responsibility to support the Council as the centre-stage of dialogue and collective action to address the multiple challenges of security and development.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Argüello (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Madame President, on presiding over this important meeting. We in Latin American and the Caribbean are very pleased with the veritable political success achieved by the Mission of Brazil in convening us for this debate. The issue of the interdependence between security and development is not only essential to the life of the Organization. Brazil's demonstrated ability to bring us together, as evidenced by the number of Ministers and Deputy Foreign Ministers who are participating today, clearly attests to the importance of Brazil's initiative.

As we have heard today, the maintenance of international peace and security is an indispensable condition for the social and economic development of peoples, as well as a crucial goal that must guide the action of the United Nations. It is therefore essential to develop a transparent and democratic collective security system, with consolidated multilateral institutions that provide for the respect of international law and stimulate development.

Under certain conditions, the low level of development in a country or countries can lead to, or have a negative influence on, a domestic or international conflict, or even create an environment that fosters non-traditional threats to international peace and security such as terrorism, the illicit arms trade, the illicit drug trade, transnational organized crime, cybercrime and piracy, among others.

Of course, the idea of a delicate interdependence between security and development is not new. It is thus clear that the Security Council should not take over the responsibilities of other bodies of the United Nations system, such as the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Peacebuilding Commission or the World Bank.

It is also clear that peacekeeping operations cannot become development operations, fulfilling the

responsibilities of the United Nations Development Programme or other agencies. The key lies instead in thinking about how the Council can take into account the issue of development in making decisions related to international peace and security so as to make these decisions more effective. In that respect, a task still to be completed is improving the working methods of the Security Council and its relationship with the General Assembly in order to allow for more fluid and transparent interaction with other United Nations agencies whose mandates are related to development.

In that regard, the role of the Security Council should be to listen to those bodies and consider their points of view, rather than to impose its own priorities. This would allow the Security Council to have more elements available when making decisions on the continuation, withdrawal or reconfiguration of a given peacekeeping mission, in particular with regard to the degree of stability achieved on the ground.

In that connection, it is clear that in cases such as Haiti the fact that basic peace and stability conditions have been met, but without corresponding institutional, social and economic development, is a necessary but in sufficient condition for the withdrawal of the mission. As has happened in similar situations in the past, a precipitous withdrawal can cause the deterioration of a security situation that was achieved at great cost.

In that regard, allow me to recall a concept that has been developed over some time now, namely, that peacekeeping and peacebuilding efforts should be carried out in parallel, not in sequence. This concept, along with integral planning for peacekeeping missions, can help both to reduce the time during which troops need to be on the ground and to mitigate the risk of relapse into conflict due to factors specifically related to a lack of development.

As has been indicated in several presidential statements by the Council, peacebuilding is the mediator between the maintenance of peace and sustainable development in the aftermath of a conflict. That is why sustainable peacebuilding requires an integrated approach that strengthens coherence between security and development activities by promoting human rights and the rule of law. It is therefore important to highlight the need for better coordination in the work of bilateral and multilateral donors, which, in any case, needs to be undertaken by the United Nations in keeping with the priorities established by local authorities.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. Cuello Camilo (Dominican Republic) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to start by echoing the very kind words Argentina expressed for the Mission of Brazil. The Dominican Republic thanks the Brazilian presidency for convening this debate on security and development, an issue on which the Brazilian delegation has shown a sustained and coherent commitment in all forums.

The Dominican Republic aligns itself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-aligned Movement.

The international community has considered security and development for quite some time. However, addressing it effectively has continued to elude our best efforts. Since 1998, we have considered the issue of creating lasting peace based on the seminal report of the Secretary-General on sustainable development in Africa (S/1998/318). And since 2001 we have been aware of the need to create a strategy to strengthen peace based on the interdependence among sustainable peace, security and development in all of its dimensions.

The promotion of development is the common thread running through the continuum that exists between the maintenance and strengthening of peace. While the promotion of development is clearly not part of the Security Council's mandate, the Council's consideration of it has become inevitable for the effective operation of the missions that it authorizes and oversees. It is, after all, sustainable human development that creates the conditions for sustainable peace. It also provides equal opportunity for all in a legally secure framework within a context of political stability and harmony with the natural environment, including generating decent jobs. Equal opportunity also ensures access to basic health and education services, as well as to energy, drinking water and sanitation, all without distinction to race, class or geographical location. Legally assured security, anchored in a constitutional framework, guarantees both political democracy, human rights and equality for all before the law. But it also provides for economic democracy and guarantees the right to property and

promotes free market competition for all as both producers and consumers.

It also provides political stability rooted in a pluralistic system of representative parties that allows for a change in power among the various forces and a new leadership within each of them. It produces harmony with the natural environment, protected in a non-polluting energy matrix, a properly rewarded and distributed use of non-renewable resources and forest conservation for the enjoyment of future generations. It provides decent jobs that enable entrepreneurs and workers to live in dignity during and after their productive lives.

When we look at the Haitian case in the light of those considerations, we can understand the absence of sustainable development or sustainable peace in that country, in spite of the committed work of the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti for more than seven years. That is because unequal opportunities are the main source of social injustice in rural areas and the marginalized neighbourhoods of cities, leading to discontent, protests and crime.

That is exactly what we find in Haiti, where 90 per cent of classrooms are in private schools and the existing schools barely have the capacity for 50 per cent of the school-age population. Legal insecurity, which is the source of unfair privileges and the cancer of corruption, gives rise to a lack of trust in the future and drives away the human and financial capital needed for development.

In a country without a land registry, as in Haiti, the right of land ownership is weak, hence the continuing migration from the country to the city and the exodus of emigrants abroad. Political instability discourages the hopes of new generations for a better tomorrow. That leads to the absence in Haiti of new leaders supported by sound parties, which makes the return of former dictators of both extremes of the political spectrum irrelevant.

Environmental degradation prevents the long-term survival of human settlements, increasing their food insecurity and lack of nutrition and putting them at greater risk in the face of inevitable natural disasters that increasingly strike the world more intensely. That has led to the deforestation of 98 per cent of Haitian territory owing to the use of charcoal as the main source of energy and ancestral slash-and-burn farming practices. The lack of decent jobs at all levels of the production system also prevents an overall increase in prosperity and exacerbates inequality and social injustice.

There is thus 70 per cent unemployment in Haiti, including an uncontrollable mass of refugees from the tragic earthquake of 12 January 2010. This situation seems unlikely to change in the short term given the absence of better conditions for sustainable development to ensure sustainable peace.

Except for admirable exceptions, in today's debate most interventions have proposed defining the responsibilities of the institutional actors that must necessarily cooperate in building sustainable peace, security and development. For the Dominican Republic, defining responsibilities could be endlessly discussed without reaching a peacebuilding strategy on the basis of the interdependence among sustainable peace, security and development in all their dimensions, as called for by the Security Council for 10 years.

The Dominican Republic therefore believes that such a strategy must be based on a clear definition of what the representative of France referred to as the transition and exit scenario in the Council's presidential statement of February 2010 (S/PRST/2010/2). That scenario, I wish to reiterate, must create the legal and institutional conditions for equal opportunities in a context of legal security, political stability, harmony with the natural environment and the creation of decent jobs.

If that scenario is defined in the light of a sustainable development strategy that enjoys the full commitment of local actors, it could well make it possible for us to exit from peacekeeping operations; for we would have laid the foundations of peacebuilding in order to leave sustainable peace on the ground.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Senegal.

Mr. Diallo (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): I would like to begin by warmly thanking the Federative Republic of Brazil for having organized this open debate on the item "Maintenance of international peace and security: the interdependence between security and development". This timely initiative demonstrates the remarkable work that your country, Madame President, is doing within the Security Council.

Senegal aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The severity and the number of armed conflicts across the world, in particular in Africa, despite the tireless efforts that we have made to date, remain a source of great concern and raise increasing questions about the long-term effectiveness of the strategies to resolve crises. Indeed, given the growing complexity of conflict situations, it seems essential to rethink our strategies to prevent and manage crises in the light of the new demands and challenges by promoting comprehensive and integrated approaches based on lessons learned.

In his report entitled "In larger freedom", former Secretary-General Kofi Annan stated that "we will not enjoy development without security, we will not enjoy security without development". (*A/59/2005, para. 17*) That statement is all the more true given the experience gained in peacekeeping and peacebuilding in several areas of the world, especially in the African continent, which amply demonstrates that security and development are two mutually reinforcing goals.

Moreover, in the absence of peace and security, it proves difficult to create the conditions conducive to establishing good economic and political governance, likely to put an end to the causes of underdevelopment, which inevitably leads to political and social instability. Such vulnerability linked to underdevelopment is even greater given the economic and financial crises affecting the world and the adverse effects of climate change increasing tensions related to access to vital resources. The food riots that we have witnessed these past years are sufficient proof in that regard. Therefore, if we wish to establish viable and lasting peace, more consistent global strategies must be considered in which activities to promote security are accompanied by development efforts.

As you rightly recalled in your concept paper (S/2011/50), Madame President, the purpose of this debate is not to establish scenarios that could lead to the Security Council infringing on the powers of other organs of the Organization, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in particular. Rather, I believe, it involves, beyond defining an integrated comprehensive response, promoting synergies and close interaction between the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, and the other United Nations organs, funds and programmes, so that prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities can lead to viable and lasting peace. That requires us to reorient our approach in order to better take into account of the dual need to integrate into our strategies to maintain international peace and security the dimension of development and striving to strengthen cooperation among the various United Nations bodies.

In that regard, it could be timely to underscore certain priority actions in order to comprehensively address the deep-seated causes of conflict. Those include the following. We must ensure that prevention efforts also cover development activities, in addition to political decisions and humanitarian action. We must take into account the priorities laid out by the countries in question with respect to programmes to strengthen and build peace. We must create the conditions for effective cooperation between all stakeholders and establish strategic frameworks for reconstruction and development after conflicts. We must combat all threats to international peace and security that could undermine the foundations of the State, such as drug trafficking, the proliferation and illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons and, of course, terrorism. And we must strengthen the cooperation between the Security Council and the Peacebuilding Commission so that the latter can fulfill its role as a consultative entity.

In short, these combined measures would serve a double purpose: they would better prevent and contain crises by finding lasting solutions to them.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Kenya.

Mr. Kamau (Kenya): I thank you, Madame President, for giving me this opportunity to address the Council on this very important topic. We also thank the Secretary-General, the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Rwanda, and the representative of the World Bank for their statements earlier.

We would also like to associate ourselves with the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The most pressing challenge to peace and development in Africa is the attainment of accelerated economic development based on the bedrock of human

development, equity and security. The specific underlying causes of the strife, conflict or civil intimidation that are the primary obstacles to peace and security on our continent are many, varied and well documented.

African leaders and, indeed, the people of Africa have devoted considerable effort to countering failed governance and the absence of peace, security and development. Thankfully, those efforts have not gone unrewarded. Inn recent years the continent has witnessed, despite some persistent and glaring failures, an impressive revival and reconstruction of countries amid the abandonment of violence and the acquisition of new freedoms and liberation.

But even as we sit here today, the failures and glaring exceptions and the real and imminent threat of reversals in some countries must surely be cause for concern and pause for introspection, and there is no better place to undertake this introspection than here in the United Nations Security Council.

While there can be little debate that development and security are intertwined and interdependent, the very fact that we are discussing the issue suggests that there is some discomfort as to the manner in which the interface is collectively understood and collectively managed — here in the United Nations, but equally importantly in continental institutions and even national bodies.

In our reality in Kenya, security is indeed the precursor for peace and development. But it does not necessarily follow that any price must be paid for security, because in and of itself, security does not guarantee peace or development. Thus, a balance has to be struck by those who may wish to exercise collective management over matters of security.

Most of our countries are either in economic transition or are fledgling democracies or young nation-States. For the most part, all these countries are still in the natural process of solidifying homogeneity, establishing their national identity and/or extending constitutional and civil liberties to their populations.

These characteristics of our countries make for a complex, highly sensitive and potentially explosive national political and social environment. This fact, however, we feel is sometimes lost on this Council and other global bodies that are dominated by countries that are politically and economically stable and historically privileged. This is particularly so when the apparent rush to enforce security overruns the need for considered and deep appreciation of the situational and historical conditions that characterize fractured societies, fledgling democracies or transitional economies.

At times, sadly, the converse is also true: the threat of insecurity is downplayed in efforts to play up a global value such as good governance. These affirmations on our part must not be construed as suggesting that we do not believe that democracy, civil liberties and sustainable security and development go hand in glove, because they do. But attaining these core values is a delicate process fraught with reversals and disappointments. What is important is the clear understanding that, at times, reversals and disappointments are inherent to the nature of free democracies and, moreover, that the rush to suppress or contain those developments by external means, international institutions or coercive force may in fact lead to the abortion of the democratic process and a lapse into insecurity, or even worse.

For Kenya, our future security and our development lie in our domestication of our new Constitution and the concomitant building of the institutions that are the means of domesticating it. But we are also painfully aware that without political harmony and commensurate rapid economic growth and equitable prosperity, our Constitution will not be worth the paper it is written on.

Let me conclude by making a small plea: that those who may wish to assign themselves the noble task of managing collective global peace and security do so by focusing on the direction of progress, prosperity, peace and human development, rather than on the character or familiarity of the progress. Every nation will have to find its own path. That is a truism that holds fast for every nation — a fact that we hope the Security Council will uphold in carrying out its most important mandate.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Philippines.

Mr. Cabactulan (Philippines): The Philippines congratulates Brazil on the outstanding leadership of the Security Council this month. My delegation also commends His Excellency Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Minister for External Relations of Brazil, for his initiative in spearheading this open debate on the

maintenance of international peace and security and the interdependence between security and development.

Security is a precondition for development, and without sustained development, security cannot be achieved. It may seem a play on words, but the reality is that these two issues are intertwined and symbiotic.

The founding fathers of the United Nations realized this when they established this Organization. The Security Council itself recognized this through its 1997 presidential statement (S/PRST/1997/46), which resulted in the Secretary-General's 1998 landmark report (S/1998/318) on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa.

Peace and security cannot be maintained and sustained without socio-economic development being pursued in parallel. This idea provided the rationale for creating the Economic and Social Council as one of the main pillars of the United Nations and other specialized agencies to precisely address the issue of poverty and underdevelopment. We now call this the soft power approach to promoting peace and security.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of this soft power approach in our collective efforts to prevent the surge of violence, lawlessness and armed conflict in certain parts of the globe. In our interdependent and highly networked world, any tension and conflict in a country or region can easily spill over to others, negatively affecting not just the peace and stability of distant countries but also their economy and livelihood.

The presence of security in a country or region does not necessarily spawn development, but pursuing development without security is virtually impossible. In extreme cases, underdevelopment and the lack of security is a recipe for chaos and disaster.

This assertion is clearly supported by the World Bank's report on conflict, security and development, which has a direct bearing on our discussions here today. The World Bank's annual *World Development Report* always provides valuable insights into key issues of global importance, and this year's edition will undoubtedly fuel much discussion and, hopefully, result in better international policymaking, including within the Security Council. From my initial understanding of the report, it appears that the World Bank has tackled the issue of security in a slightly broader sense than is the custom in the Security Council. The prism of analysis looks at conflict, fragility, terrorism and organized and transnational crime as the sources of violence that gravely affect development.

Just to cite a concrete example of transnational crime as it relates to development, the current state of affairs in Somalia is now a major concern for the international community and the Philippines. The breakdown in peace and order and the inability of the Somali Government to manage security and foster socio-economic development in that strategic and resource-rich country triggered the intensification of maritime piracy, not just in the country's coastal waters but also in the Gulf of Aden and the wider Indian Ocean. Pirate attacks on cargo ships have increased in volume and violence in recent months. As we speak, 138 Filipino seafarers on board 12 ships are being held captive by Somali pirates. We pray for their early and safe release so that they can return to their beloved families and resume normal lives.

The Somali case clearly demonstrates that security and development go hand in hand. The failure to address that country's security and development needs will have a negative impact on East Africa and the wider world. In our region of the world, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), whose members are all developing countries, has long recognized the detrimental impact of transnational crime on development. Consequently, an ASEAN Plan of Action to Combat Transnational Crime was developed on the basis of discussions that began in the early 1970s.

The challenges that lie ahead of us are many and daunting. The world expects the Security Council to lead the way and to take the necessary steps to tackle and resolve the major root causes of unrest and conflict in our times. Preventive diplomacy and the soft-power approach are in most instances more effective than military engagement. But that will require a totally different perspective and innovative approaches to peace and security, such as the ongoing peacebuilding architecture review that we all support.

Once again, the Philippines commends you, Madame President, and the Security Council. Our open debate today has planted the seeds for a greater understanding of the subject and has laid the foundation for a more comprehensive and synergistic approach to the interdependence between security and

development — the twin issues that will continue to dictate the agenda of the United Nations in the years to come.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Finland.

Mr. Vilnanen (Finland): On behalf of the Nordic countries, let me start by thanking the delegation of Brazil for convening today's important debate.

The Millennium Declaration (General Assembly resolution 55/2) and World Summit Outcome document (General Assembly resolution 60/1) specifically address the interlinkages between peace and security, human rights and development. One pillar is not sustainable without the two others. We need an approach that places the security of people before institutions and mandates.

Human rights violations are at the root of many conflicts. The protection and promotion of all human rights must remain at the core of our responses. The Council itself has recognized the importance of human rights to peace and security. As efforts are made to strengthen the linkages between security and development, it is crucial to ensure that all actors integrate human rights into their efforts.

National ownership needs to be emphasized. Lasting peace and long-term development cannot be imposed. National capacities for setting development priorities following an armed conflict are often weak. War-torn societies need assistance in restoring trust and in addressing key concerns, such as building credible security, strengthening the rule of law and facilitating economic recovery.

Engaging women in all efforts is essential. Despite women's involvement in peace initiatives, they are too often excluded from peace negotiations. That undermines efforts to achieve long-term peace. The empowerment of women is a precondition for long-term development and peace.

The peacebuilding architecture of the United Nations was set up to address the gap between stabilization and long-term development. Too often, however, the lack of synchronization between peacekeeping operations and development programmes leads to a failure to deliver. I would like to point out three challenges in that respect.

First, as the mandates of United Nations bodies are not likely to change significantly, we should ask ourselves how the United Nations can work better using the existing tools and deal with the shortcomings. In that regard, we look forward to the recommendations of the review of civilian capacities and their swift implementation. For the United Nations system as a whole, we must do more to advance integration, coordination and delivering as one. The current structure is often a disincentive to coordination. Human resources management policies, financial regulations and audit and investigation rules are some of the issues that we need to address. We must engage the Bretton Woods institutions more closely and strategically. We believe that the 2011 *World Development Report* will provide good insight in our ongoing discussions. Coherence can be achieved only if we, as donors and Member States, practice what we preach. We must ensure that mandated tasks are properly funded to allow for their full implementation.

Secondly, Council mandates should not be overloaded. That includes an honest assessment of the role of the mission and of which tasks would be better undertaken by other United Nations entities or partners. Mandates must be matched by resources. Peacekeeping missions have become integrated and multifunctional. They have broader mandates and last longer than in the past. A telling example in that regard are elections, which were an exit point in the earliest missions and have now become a benchmark for most. Peacekeeping today includes peacebuilding. There is a limit to what peacekeepers can and should do, and to the role of other actors. Nevertheless, it is in the interest of the Council that a mission be sufficiently equipped to support efforts for achieving the level of stability necessary for a handover to peacebuilding and development actors.

Thirdly, there should be room for closer interaction between the Council and development partners. The Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission's country-specific configuration should be invited to the Council when a country on the Council's agenda is also on the agenda of the Commission. One should also consider other options for engaging non-members of the Council beyond consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries.

We need an approach that is centred on the security and safety of individuals. Our success or failure is measured by how much we manage to reduce

vulnerabilities and increase the opportunities for people affected by conflict. The conflict in South Sudan will serve as an important test case. We hope that the United Nations can deliver a coordinated, cohesive and efficient response in support of a people that has suffered from decades of armed violence and poverty.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Burkina Faso.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): I would first like to congratulate you, Madame President, on your country's assumption of the Security Council presidency for the month of February. I also wish to thank you for organizing today's important debate on the interdependence between security and development.

My delegation associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Egypt on the behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The debates of the Security Council on peacekeeping and peacebuilding strategies and post-conflict reconstruction reflect the importance of linking security and development.

It has been well established that no development can occur in an unsafe and unstable environment. The Secretary-General rightly mentioned that fact in his 1998 report on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa (S/1998/318).

The Security Council should therefore place considerable emphasis on development issues in its approach and its deliberations. Today's conflicts and threats to peace are highly complex, as evidenced by socio-political crises, including in Somalia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Sudan, and can undermine and even decimate development efforts.

Similarly, the hunger riots sparked by the multifaceted crises that we have experienced in recent years; the specific acts of violence and even terrorism fuelled by despair and misery; and other current events, to name but a few, prove today more than ever that peace, security and development form a whole. For that reason, together they contribute to putting and keeping the issue of human security at the heart of the debate.

Security can no longer be viewed only through a politico-military lens. We must henceforth take into consideration the new dimensions of security that lead to the full development of the individual. And, because they can be a source a conflict, it falls to the Security Council to fully understand what they represent and, in coordination with the Secretary-General and the other relevant bodies of the United Nations, to detect the early signs of tension and crisis. In other words, prevention must take its proper place among the strategies we use to ensure peace and security by promoting sustainable development and equitable access to the benefits of growth, including youth employment and women's full enjoyment of their rights.

In countries in conflict or emerging from conflict — where everything must be rebuilt, particularly in matters of security, basic social services, State justice institutions and economic activity — a timely, effective and appropriate response of the international community is critical to avoiding a resurgence of violence and a return to chaos. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding must take a central place in the actions of the United Nations and the international community as a whole. To that end, the role of the Security Council is to interact with the other relevant organs of the United Nations and, as necessary, to establish and strengthen its existing complementary and interactive relations with them, especially the Peacebuilding Commission, so as to ensure that greater account is taken of peacebuilding in the peacekeeping phase.

In this context, we reiterate the recommendation of the Security Council in its presidential statement of 12 February 2010 (S/PRST/2010/2), concerning the establishment of peacebuilding plans with clear objectives to allow each mission to achieve its goals and move beyond peacekeeping into peacebuilding. Furthermore, we welcome the fact that the Security Council stressed the importance of ensuring that mandated peacebuilding activities are undertaken as soon as possible in every peacekeeping operation, in coordination with the United Nations country team and taking due account of security questions and the priorities of the host country. We must take greater advantage of successful transitions to ensure that these recommendations be implemented.

In this interaction, we welcome the role of the Peacebuilding Commission and other organs, agencies, funds and programmes of the United Nations, as well as the strategic partnerships and arrangements with

certain institutions, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. It is also important that cooperation continue with regional and subregional organizations, which can bring added value to the search for solutions to the threats to the domestic security and stability of States.

There is no doubt that particular attention should be given to activities and programmes dealing with the reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, and security sector reform in order to create the conditions conducive to relaunching economic activity. The success of such programmes requires greater inclusion of all sectors of society, particularly the most vulnerable groups represented by women and young people. Furthermore, efforts should be pursued to improve coordination and coherence among all actors.

In conclusion, we express the hope that the recommendations emanating from this debate will ensure that the interdependence between security and development will be duly taken into account in the deliberations of the Security Council. We are confident that the involvement and efforts of the United Nations system and the entire international community will increasingly contribute to identifying the relevant answers to the need to establish a framework of peace and security that promotes development.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Mr. Valero Briceño (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, we would like to express our gratitude to the delegation of the Federative Republic of Brazil in its capacity as President of the Security Council for the month of February. As a friend of that delegation, we wish it every success in its conduct of the Council's business. Our delegation associates itself with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement, which largely reflects Venezuela's concerns on this subject.

The concept note before us on interdependence between security and development states that

> "social, political and economic exclusion can contribute to the eruption or protraction of or relapse into violence and conflict" (*S/2011/50, annex, p. 2*),

and that therefore they are

> "relevant to the Council in discharging its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security" (*ibid., p. 3*).

The note adds that

> "[i]n some conflict and post-conflict situations, the Security Council may determine that certain socio-economic issues constitute a threat to international peace and security in their own right" (*ibid., p. 4*).

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela agrees that overcoming poverty, inequality and oppression is essential to maintaining peace among and within nations. However, there are elements in this note of concern to my country. We are concerned, for example, about the possibility that the language of this note could be used by serial interventionists to argue that countries with poor, socially or politically excluded populations pose threats to international peace and security that should be addressed through outside intervention.

Our delegation believes that such an interpretation must absolutely be questioned by those of us who defend dignity, the richness of cultural and religious diversity, the right of all peoples of the world to self-determination, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-intervention in internal affairs, as steadfast principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter, which must be respected scrupulously.

For the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, security and development should remain separate issues. The United Nations development agenda falls to the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the relevant agencies, and depends and must depend primarily on Member States. The Security Council has already held debates on such issues as climate change, migration, maritime transport and access to potable water, among others, in order to imbue them with a discourse of fear and security.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela calls on the Security Council to limit itself to exercising the powers entrusted to it by the United Nations Charter. Inclusive and fully representative multilateralism is not only the approach to addressing these issues, but also the appropriate way to ensure that the Security Council respects the competencies that have been defined by the States Members of the United Nations. We

therefore regret that the Security Council intends to securitize the entire multilateral agenda within the concept of selective multilateralism.

If it is proposed that we address the structural causes of poverty, we should consider what has been called "structural violence" — inter alia, those policies emanating from the world power centres that have a decisive influence on creating poverty and on reducing the quality of the lives of the peoples of developing countries. Poverty is not a historical inevitability, but a consequence of historical asymmetries between developed and developing countries and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. If the Security Council is interested in attacking the root causes of poverty by eliminating unequal power relations between developed and developing countries, it will enjoy the full support of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Malaysia.

Mr. Abdullah (Malaysia): Security and development, in the context of nation-building and the maintenance of international peace and security, are two sides of the same coin. Nations cannot prosper without internal security and stability. A nation facing the collapse of its national security, and subsequently its economy, becomes a threat not only to its people, but to the region as a whole. The world has seen such tragedies in the past. We should not allow these tragedies to recur.

In addressing the need for development, with security being the utmost prerequisite, the Security Council can play a vital role. Peacekeeping missions mandated by the Security Council, in tandem with the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) and the other development agencies of the United Nations system, should be equipped with development components. While peacekeepers carry out their mandated peacekeeping tasks, the Peacebuilding Commission, together with the other development agencies of the United Nations system, can work on projects and activities that generate employment and income. Such efforts, when successfully implemented, can help to sustain the peace and stability of the State.

The world today is witness to internal strife faced by member nations, which is caused mainly by the rising price of food, the high rate of unemployment among young people, and poverty. The spectre of high oil prices and the sudden rise in the price of commodities that we witnessed in the summer of 2008 are back. The price of wheat has shot up by almost 80 per cent in the past six months, while the price of rice has increased by almost 50 per cent in the same period. These increases have resulted in high inflation rates in many countries. The developing world is again facing the brunt of this jump in staple food prices. This rising cost of living impacts heavily on the internal stability of the most vulnerable least developed and developing countries.

We are of the view that the Security Council can play a role through its horizon-scanning consultations. In tandem with the PBC, the Economic and Social Council, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and other relevant agencies of the United Nations system, the Council can examine and analyse the prevailing scenarios, and come up with suggestions and proposals on ways for affected Member States to tackle those sources of instability. Recent events in the Middle East show how a sudden rise in the price of food, combined with widespread unemployment, can destabilize nations.

To conclude, Malaysia strongly believes that political stability is sine qua non to achieving economic development and prosperity. Stable and prosperous nations can bring about regional and global peace. The Security Council can play a major role in this regard.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Vidal (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Through you, Madame, I wish to congratulate Brazil on having convened this Security Council debate on the interdependence between security and development. As proposed in the concept note before the Council (S/2011/50, annex), this concept is being addressed as a complex relationship. That is due to a number of reasons, including the existence of numerous actors and activities that are interrelated and often overlap, as well as to the specificities of each case, making it very difficult to offer uniform responses.

One additional difficulty in addressing this issue in the Security Council is related to the Council's instinctive tendency to prioritize security issues when addressing the eruption or seeking a way out of an armed conflict, while neglecting issues connected to

economic and social development in the affected country or region. Certainly, without security there can be no development, because the former is a sine qua non for the latter. Certainly, too, underdevelopment and poverty are not necessarily decisive causes in generating conflict, while a number of actors within the United Nations system have more responsibility for the issue of development than does the Security Council.

Yet, it is also true that, without adequate and early recourse to all instruments available within the system to promote the sustainable economic development of the country or region affected by conflict, there is a serious risk of a relapse into violence that may undo years and sometimes decades of great human and material effort and cost devoted to the maintenance of peace, and result in the sustained maintenance of the security component on the ground without envisioning a safe exit strategy.

We have seen that in the two missions to which Uruguay has contributed a considerable number of personnel. These are the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo — which until recently was the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo — in which we have participated for 12 consecutive years, and the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti, in which we are entering our seventh year, although the United Nations military presence in Haiti dates back to 1994.

It is on the basis of that experience that Uruguay, along with a number of other countries, promotes at every possible opportunity — be it in consultations on peace mission mandates within the Peacebuilding Commission, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations or other forums — the strengthening of support for peace missions and peacebuilding in the receiving State. We also focus on efforts to promote sustainable economic and social development.

It is difficult for a peacekeeping operation to resolve all causes of conflict, and we do not believe that that should be its goal or its indicator for determining an end to a mission. However, it is essential for the mission to begin working from the outset to strengthen national institutions and capacities so that they can peacefully resolve problems on their own. Strengthening institutional capacities in the security and rule of law sectors is crucial, and we therefore encourage the Council to continue to include this aspect in peace mission mandates.

That, however, is not the only area in which peace operations have the capacity to have a positive influence. The disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants are also fundamental, not only because of the likelihood of a resurgence of conflict, but also because a large number of individuals may turn to crime in the future. We therefore need to ensure a positive economic environment with prospects for growth.

Unemployment among the young has been identified by the PBC review panel as a potential threat to any peacebuilding process. That is why the Commission has taken up the recommendation to focus on generating employment in this sector of society, and considers its implementation a priority. In part, this can be carried out through immediate-impact projects managed by peacekeeping operations, which generate tangible peace dividends and have been successful in countries such as Haiti.

Finally, another crucial area where peacekeeping operations where can make a major difference is in rebuilding infrastructure, which is a key multiplier of development in countries affected by conflict. Sufficient material capacity and appropriate deployment conditions are essential to carrying out this task. In all of these activities, developing countries possess great potential for cooperation. To that end, we have significantly increased our bilateral contribution to countries in the aforementioned situation. We also believe it essential to strengthen mechanisms for South-South cooperation through so-called triangular cooperation, in which the countries with the greatest financial capacities participate in an effort to meet these challenges most effectively.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Al Habib (Islamic Republic of Iran): At the outset, I wish to congratulate the delegation of Brazil on its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I also thank Brazil for organizing this important open debate on the interlinkage between security and development.

Security and development are two sides of the same coin. Conflicts, wars and security threats can easily erase economic opportunities and prospects for

growth. Decades of economic achievement can quickly vanish when insecurity and instability move in. At the same time, development is the solid base of peace and security. There is a common belief that if poverty is not uprooted and economic prosperity provided, the world will become susceptible to conflict and insecurity. Sustainable economic development and peace are therefore inextricably interlinked. It is disappointing to note, however, that development per se has remained aloof from the top priorities of the United Nations.

Most of the time, the relevant deliberations have been tainted by rhetoric, hot-air promises on aid and tough conditions for transfer of know-how and technology. It is therefore unsurprising that 1 billion people of the world still live with hunger and poverty and that, consequently, the world is not a safer or more secure place than it was in prior decades.

The root causes of many conflicts in recent history have been nothing but extreme poverty, exclusion and marginalization, foreign interventions and military excursions and occupation. Unfortunately, in addressing the maintenance of international peace and security, the Council has in many instances failed to take these causes into account. This is not because the Council has been unaware of these grounds; rather, the political considerations of some powerful members have always been the main driving force in preventing the Council from taking meaningful action to uproot the causes of insecurity and thus pave the way for the promotion of sustainable development and economic prosperity.

Even these powerful members have not felt obliged to respond to or be accountable to the greater international community, as represented by the General Assembly, for the impacts of their performance. The saddening reality is that, due to the influence exercised by these members, decisions made by the Council have contributed to prolonging, if not exacerbating conflicts, with severe impacts on the economic development and well-being of the concerned populations and overall global economic development and progress. Perhaps it is time for those responsible for such situations to recognize the need to improve accountability and transparency in their conduct. Particularly, they should bear the responsibility of their actions and positions on development at both the national and international levels. Their currently unchecked rights should be commensurate with balanced responsibilities.

As a matter of fact, resort by the Council to the provisions of Chapter VII, in particular the imposition of economic sanctions in the interests of the economic and political purposes of some big Powers, has always hindered economic opportunities and the basic human rights of ordinary people in the affected countries. There is ample evidence that sanctions first and foremost put the economic growth and prosperity of people in peril, as well as their rights to food, medication, clean water, education, decent job and shelter. Briefly, their right to development is being targeted unjustifiably by the wholly antagonistic will of the hegemonic Powers, as reflected in some of the Council's resolutions. Indeed, the main feature of sanctions turns out to be a tool to impose the hegemonic intentions of some big Powers on other nations and populations, under the pretext of spurring international peace and security. Therefore, economic sanctions, whosoever imposes them and under any pretext or disguise whatsoever, remain illegitimate, futile and misguidedly punitive.

The Council's adoption of a new and constructive approach to the issue of development will very much depend on a reform of its structure and modus operandi in order to balance to the rights and responsibilities of its permanent members.

I would like to add in conclusion that there are, of course, valuable lessons that need to be learned from the causes of conflict in order to promote durable peace and sustainable development. However, there is no straightjacket formula. The causes of conflict and underdevelopment in the Middle East, for instance, may not necessarily share features with those in Africa. Thus, the measures to be taken to prevent conflict and advance on the road to development should accord with the peculiarities and specificities of each and every situation.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Georgia.

Mr. Tsiskarashvili (Georgia): Georgia commends Brazil's timely initiative in organizing this open debate, which is aimed at addressing one of the most challenging matters before the United Nations. We are also grateful for the incisive concept paper prepared by the presidency of the Council (S/2011/50).

While Georgia has aligned itself with the statement made by the Acting Head of the delegation

of the European Union, I would like to take this opportunity to stress some additional points.

My delegation shares the view of the entire United Nations family that security and development, along with human rights, are inseparable and mutually reinforcing notions. It is obvious that no development agenda can be fully realized in the presence of security restrictions and that, vice versa, genuine security will never be achieved without a development. Interdependence is evident; development contributes to greater security and security creates an environment conducive to development.

In this context, many speakers today have comprehensively described examples of how development issues impact the core aspects of peace and security. Georgia could not add more, but subscribes to the positions expressed by the other delegations. At the same time, we are convinced that special attention has to be paid in our deliberations to the impact of an insecure environment on the development agenda. It is crystal clear that instability and volatility have harmful effects on all aspects of national development agendas.

My country is a vivid example of this. Lack of security, a general atmosphere of chaos and lawlessness, ethnically-based and other gross human rights violations, as well as thriving organized crime in the occupied territories of Georgia, have an overall harmful effect on all major aspects of the national development agenda, especially within the occupied territories themselves. Economic and social development, general healthcare, natural resource management, environment protection and other areas are challenged. The ongoing occupation and continuing violation of the ceasefire agreement by the occupying Power make it enormously difficult to bring these disturbing developments to an end.

Nevertheless, these dire conditions can in no way serve as an excuse for Georgia to just settle with blame-shifting and to give up efforts to move forward. To this end, Georgia has undertaken the unilateral obligation not to use force and thus contribute to facilitating the establishment of secure conditions in the occupied territories. Moreover, in order to assist human development in those regions of Georgia, the Government adopted the State Strategy on Occupied Territories: Engagement through Cooperation and a subsequent action plan, which envisage development and improvement in all fields of social life.

We believe these decisions and commitments will inevitably contribute to the process of securing peace and stability in Georgia and will peacefully challenge the existing status quo established by the use of force. Obviously, these efforts should advance in concert with the international community's strong engagement.

My delegation hopes that all the views, proposals and individual experiences expressed during today's debate will be adequately followed up and translated into concrete action, which can strengthen peace, security and development worldwide.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of El Salvador.

Mr. García González (El Salvador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to express my delegation's satisfaction with your timely initiative, Madame President, to convene today's open debate in the Security Council on the maintenance of peace and international security and the interdependence between security and development. This initiative under the presidency of Brazil in the Security Council and the leadership of its Minister for Foreign Affairs, Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, clearly reflects the concern of the international community to tackle in greater depth the existing links between security and development and their relationship with successful peacebuilding strategies in post-conflict situations.

El Salvador, as a post-conflict country that has gone through a peacebuilding process with the support of the international community, recognizes the importance of considering this issue, primarily because we see that the root of conflicts can most often be found in the inability of States and their political classes to offer a timely and appropriate response to the basic needs of the population while at the same time taking into account criteria for inclusion and social justice.

In this context, I recall the recognition by our heads of State and Government, at the Millennium Summit and at the High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly on the Millennium Development Goals, that peace and security, development and human rights are the pillars of the United Nations system and the foundations for collective security and well-being. They also

recognized that development, peace and security and human rights are interlinked and mutually reinforcing.

El Salvador has taken note of the debates held by the Security Council in the past with regard to the interrelations among the maintenance of peace, peacebuilding and the need to adopt a broad and comprehensive approach to the issue of peace and security.

We agree with other delegations that the convening of today's debate, in particular, can help further clarify Member States' vision of how better to provide a climate for cooperation and complementarity among the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. El Salvador welcomes the role of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) in that regard and centres its hopes on the concrete contributions of the PBC in its country-specific configurations showing the potential for continually strengthening synergies among the various main bodies of the Organization.

The complexity and depth of the challenges facing many developing countries — particularly with regard to the insecurity of citizens, drug-trafficking, transnational organized crime and gangs — mean that we need to reflect on the urgent need to promote strategies that provide effective security for all with freedom for all and equity among all. The security of citizens is therefore essential for human development. As was quite rightly pointed out by the Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, "Without development, we will not have security, and without security, we will not achieve development."

The way in which this issue is tackled in the international sphere primarily involves the complementary efforts of dialogue and coordination among the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council on the one hand, and the active role of Member States themselves, civil society and international organizations, as strategic allies, on the other.

Finally, El Salvador trusts that the Security Council will continue to pay attention to these considerations, which surely will contribute to the future success of its work in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Nicaragua.

Mrs. Rubiales de Chamorro (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me to first congratulate you, Madame President, your country and your delegation for your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We know that the experience and leadership of Brazil, a sister country in our region and an important partner in the sustainable development of Nicaragua, predicts the success of the work of the Council this month. We also welcome the noble determination and energy of Brazil in this initiative to convene this open debate on the maintenance of international peace and security, interdependence between security and development.

At the outset, I wish to align myself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Egypt, on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

In this debate, during which we are called on to reflect on the interdependence between security and development, we should, as a starting point, take into account the functions, powers and responsibilities of each of the United Nations bodies and their respective agendas in strict compliance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Issues related to development fall within the purview of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. The primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is a matter for the Security Council. The interdependence between the issues of security and development continues to be an open debate in which the entire United Nations has a responsibility.

The complexity of peacekeeping operations requires a slightly different approach than the current one, an approach which takes into account the needs of each situation for which such operations are being mobilized. The full agreement and involvement of the States affected are imperative.

We must continue to work to strengthen the Peacebuilding Commission and ensure the efficient and effective coordination with the States involved, the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the United Nations agencies.

Central America offers a clear example of the options for resolving conflicts, and our experience — both the good and the bad — should be taken into account. The conflict that we experienced was the

result of foreign interference and wars of aggression, but was resolved thanks to the determination of our own peoples and the assistance of sister countries in our region. In the end, without the presence of foreigners in our region, we were able to reach peace agreements that prioritized an approach based on the need for sustainable development in order to begin the demobilization process, which led to stability, peace and security.

However, and with regard to the issue before us, we should like to point out that, after the signing of the peace accords, the development funds earmarked for our region were not channelled to us as quickly or in the amounts reserved as had been the funds provided for the war against our people. Unfortunately, today we see history repeating itself in other regions of the world. The lack of security in Central America was mentioned earlier today. Part of the problem is that we do not have sufficient funding for development projects.

Our commitment to security includes a commitment to promoting human development, defined as sustainable development with the human being at its centre and carried out in an environment of good governance and with direct civic participation in conditions of social equity. All of these elements are required for the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and beyond. That includes, as a priority of my Government, development in the most underserved areas of Nicaragua with the goal of putting an end to their historical exclusion. We refer here specifically to the Río San Juan de Nicaragua area. Our army's ongoing presence in that area has been a constant factor there for many years now. It guarantees security in the context of the fight against drug trafficking and transnational organized crime. It is the responsibility of our Government to ensure security for our citizens throughout our national territory. We will continue to exercise our sovereign right in this regard.

Moreover, and in order to guarantee sustainable development for our people, our Government has assumed its responsibilities by undertaking to dredge and clean up the San Juan de Nicaragua River and to open our historical access to the sea. This is being carried out to enhance one of our most important natural resources, which will secure the development of that area and serve the well-being of our people.

The interdependence between security and development must take into account the balance between the socio-economic realities of conflict and post-conflict situations. This balance is necessary to drawing up strategies in which development programmes are the first weapons we must consider and wield before we resort to weapons of war. At times, that order has been reversed. Sustainable development will ensure security, stability and, ultimately, peace in the world.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Sudan.

Mr. Osman (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to express our thanks and appreciation to you, Madame President, for your constructive initiative to organize this open debate to consider the interdependence between security and development — an issue of priority and a very significant question for developing countries. I would also like to express my thanks and appreciation for the concept paper prepared in this connection (S/2011/50), particularly since the Council, in accordance with its mandate, as enshrined in the Charter, is entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security.

Security, as we understand it, hinges on the consistent fulfilment of several goals, chief among which is development. Development is the sum of efforts to meet the basic needs of human beings for food, health care, education, livelihood and other requirements of a decent life. All of these are enshrined in the Holy Quran, which says that God "has fed them, [saving them] from hunger and made them safe, [saving them] from fear" *(The Holy Koran, CIV:4)*.

International awareness of the relationship between security and development has been increasing over the past decade, especially as a result of the United Nations experience in peacekeeping missions in many regions of the world. That experience has shown that a purely military approach to the deployment of peacekeeping operations will not achieve the desired results. Development must be taken into consideration in order to achieve peace.

Addressing the root causes of conflict is the most important step that the Council can take, and should enjoy special priority. As the Council is aware, there is no conflict, civil war or internal strife in which the development dimension does not somehow come into play. There is no conflict, civil war or internal strife

that cannot be attributed to a lack of development, which is the main reason for that conflict or civil war.

Certain natural factors have been compounded by climate change and its impact on the livelihoods of all human beings, whose requirements and means of sustenance vary greatly. For instance, they may be farmers or nomads, and that difference can lead to conflict or feuding between them, negatively affecting their economic and social development. Such a situation can then deteriorate into conflict, as seen in Darfur in my country and in other regions, adversely affecting the lives and security of our citizens.

The Government of the Sudan has long been aware of the relationship between security and development. It has adopted a comprehensive strategy to address the conflict in Darfur, the main pillars of which are development, rehabilitation and recovery. Our deliberations undoubtedly complement the conclusions reached by the Council in its previous debates, in particular that organized by France in February 2010 to address transition and exit strategies and the transition from conflict to stability and State-building (see S/PV.6270). Those deliberations came to the conclusion that the lack of development was the main reason for the setbacks witnessed by many post-conflict States that relapse into war.

In the open debates organized by the presidencies of Turkey and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Council discussed comprehensive peacebuilding strategies with a view to preventing the outbreak of conflict. In those debates, all Council members emphasized the close relationship between security and development.

All aspects of security, be they social, political or economic, are important in efforts to enhance peace. Peace is vital as a springboard for development. We in the Sudan have learned our lessons. The civil war that persisted in the southern part of the Sudan for more than four decades, which we ended by signing the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in January 2005, hindered the development of our country and was the main cause of the deterioration of our economy over that period. Thus, more than any other nation, we are aware of the destructive impact of conflict and its negative repercussions on development.

I wish to stress the importance of the Security Council's adoption of a comprehensive strategy combining peacekeeping activities and initiatives to promote the political path and address the root causes of conflict. In order to resolve issues remaining in the aftermath of conflict, activities should be undertaken at the outset of the transition from conflict settlement to peacebuilding. Activating the role of the Peacebuilding Commission will help to settle conflicts and ensure reconciliation in a manner consistent with the traditions of each country. That is the best way to achieve peace, especially sustainable peace, and not through mechanisms whose legal role can be called into question, thereby entrenching conflict.

Beyond activating the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, in seeking to achieve reconciliation the Security Council should coordinate with United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, including the United Nations Development Programme, in implementing short-term, quick-impact projects to meet the needs of all those affected by conflict, be they combatants or internally displaced persons. The Council should also assist in medium- and long-term development projects in post-conflict regions, thereby enabling those affected by conflict to regain their livelihoods and establishing the main conditions for stability.

In that connection, the Security Council should play a coordinating role among the various organs. It should not encourage the imposition of unilateral or multilateral economic sanctions that would only fuel and further complicate conflict at a time when our priorities should be to address and resolve conflict and achieve development.

I hope that the Security Council will address the root causes of conflict, which are mainly development-related. We call on the Council not to focus on the symptoms of conflict and to waste no time or effort in expressing its concern about those symptoms. We hope that the Council will focus on coordination with other bodies, the specialized agencies and the General Assembly in addressing development issues in countries in conflict or in post-conflict circumstances.

I would like to close by saying, Madame President, that we appreciate your initiative. We wish to stress the important responsibility of the United Nations in general, the Security Council, international partners, donors and the principal stakeholders in providing all required financial and logistical support to developing countries in the aftermath of conflict. We believe that donors often organize conferences and make generous pledges. But once peace agreements are

signed, they rarely honour those pledges. That paves the way for the vicious cycle of poverty and recurring conflict.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Shin Boonam (Republic of Korea): At the outset, I would like to express my appreciation to you, Madame President, for having organized this meaningful open debate on the maintenance of international peace and security and the interdependence between security and development.

This is the second open debate on this topic following the fruitful meeting in September last year, at which the Council highlighted the need to address the underlying causes of conflict and noted that peace and security, development and human rights are intrinsically interlinked. Indeed, as we have witnessed in the past few years with the convergence of the global financial crisis, the food crisis and the energy crisis, insecurity and conflict are often present in areas that are lacking in development. Ways to address the interdependence between security and development should be faithfully pursued in a more comprehensive and synergistic manner. This must include not only problems that stem from the environment and food and energy crises, but the overall issues of development as well.

My delegation believes that underdevelopment is the root cause of insecurity and conflict and that it must continue to be engaged by a variety of stakeholders including the Council, the General Assembly , the United Nations Development Programme, international financial institutions and civil society. By harnessing our collective efforts on elevating sustained, long-lasting development today, we can, in effect, tackle the root causes of the security conflicts of tomorrow. In this regard, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) should continue to be the centre of United Nations efforts, and United Nations leadership should be further strengthened in ensuring sustained political support and mobilizing collective efforts towards the MDGs.

One tangible way that this could be pursued is to actively focus on promoting employment opportunities for youth. This would give many young people in regions of insecurity another option beyond joining armed groups, who are often the only providers of immediate wages and sustenance. As such, development, and especially economic development, must be pursued in a sustained, inclusive and equitable manner. This is the best way to ensure that the world is both more secure and peaceful for both current and future generations.

In this connection, the Republic of Korea believes that the Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth, an integral part of the recent Group of Twenty (G-20) Summit in Seoul, could be a helpful guiding force as we strive to create a more secure world. In this regard, we look forward to concrete follow-up measures to the Seoul Consensus being taken under the French leadership of the G-20 this year.

In May, another important international forum focusing on development issues will be held, namely, the fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in Istanbul. We hope that steps will be taken in the right direction with the preparatory process of Conference, focusing on the overwhelming vulnerabilities and situations of insecurity affecting the development of least developed countries — those living with extreme poverty, hunger and inequality.

Only in a stable security environment is sustained development possible. In this regard, not only peacekeeping but also preventative diplomacy and peacebuilding activities can play an integral role in buttressing the security environment in various situations, with a view towards ensuring sustained development.

Likewise, an essential goal of peacebuilding is to provide a blueprint for the political and socio-economic development of the recipient country in a post-conflict situation. Each situation is different, however, and any peacekeeping and/or peacebuilding activity must be undertaken with early engagement, clear mandates and tangible exit strategies. Economic and social opportunities are also possible through various peacebuilding initiatives, including the establishment of good governance and the rule of law, and also through disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes and security sector reform activities. Such integrated strategies in post-conflict situations can be useful tools in bridging the gap from insecurity to development.

The Republic of Korea has learned from its own experience about the interlinked challenges of development and security. During a period of extreme

insecurity, we suffered from crippling and interconnected underdevelopment. However, with the support of the United Nations and the international community, Korea, once one of the world's poorest countries, with a lower gross domestic product per capita than many sub-Saharan African nations in the early 1960s, was able to recover from the ashes of war and successfully rebuild itself into a flourishing democracy with a vibrant market-based economy within just one generation. I sincerely hope that the United Nations and Member States will work closely together to turn the various ideas we have proposed today into concrete action. For its part, the Republic of the Korea will devote its utmost efforts to this end.

The President: I now give the floor to representative of the Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations.

Mrs. Mungwa: On behalf of His Excellency Ambassador Téte António, Permanent Observer of the African Union to the United Nations, who is away from New York this week, I would like to begin by joining previous speakers in commending you, Madame President, for having organized this debate on the interdependence between security and development, a theme of paramount importance to Africa as a developing region. The organization of this open debate is not only a mark of strong political support for this theme by the Council; it also illustrates the role the Council plays in generating new ideas to boost related efforts being made by Member States, bilatéral and multilateral donors, United Nations agencies and regional organizations such as the African Union in its overall work for the maintenance of international peace and security.

We are grateful for the leadership of His Excellency Mr. Antonio de Aguiar Patriota, Minister of External Relations of Brazil, who travelled to New York to preside over this meeting in person, and for the participation of the Secretary-General, the Ministers from Germany, Colombia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Portugal, India, Gabon, Costa Rica and Slovenia and the various other participants who made statements during this debate.

As the Security Council is aware, several countries in Africa have been the theatre of conflict linked to factors such as the illegal exploitation of resources, poverty and a lack of economic empowerment opportunities, unconstitutional changes of Government, often conducted with backing from illegal criminal networks, and a lack of opportunity, overall in particular for young people.

A new dawn has emerged in Africa, however, following intense efforts deployed by the continent to assume its share of responsibility for its own security and development. This new vision of renaissance and growth is set out in the Constitutive Act of the African Union and other instruments of the organization, which clearly assert the interdependence between security and development. One is not possible without the other, as has been affirmed by a number of speakers during this debate.

The African Union therefore, right from its launch, explicitly recognized that the persistence of conflict would undermine its broad democracy and development agenda, and therefore adopted a proactive approach to resolving conflicts in the continent. This approach emphasizes early response to potential conflict situations and active mediation on the continent in order to avert potential conflict situations. Furthermore, the policy shift from non-interference, as practiced by the former Organization of African Unity, to one of non-indifference in the African Union is a clear mark of Africa's commitment to eliminating the phenomenon of unconstitutional changes of Government that often lead to instability and insecurity, thus undermining democratic governance and development on the continent.

The African Union approach on the interdependence of security and development also underscores the core imperative of addressing the root causes of conflict in order to ensure social justice and thus attain sustainable development. Furthermore, the objectives of the Union's principles, as set out in articles 3 and 4 of its Constitutive Act, include clear provisions for the promotion of democratic institutions and respect for human rights, the rule of law and gender equality in order to strengthen popular participation and democracy. This is also vividly captured in the human security and development approach embraced by the African Union, which establishes the linkage between the financial and political stability of the State and the physical and psychological security of its people.

Though much remains to be done, Africa, with the support of the international community, has made significant progress in the ardent pursuit of this vision

for security and development, both through thematically-focused initiatives and integrated programmes and projects. These include the multilayered and synergized continent-wide peace and security architecture of the African Union, which comprises the Peace and Security Council supported by the Continental Early Warning System, the African Peer Review Mechanism, the Panel of the Wise and the African Standby Force, to name just a few.

The experience of Africa in its peace support operations in contexts including Burundi, Chad, and currently Somalia, has illustrated that military and security services can indeed work in conjunction with civilian stakeholders to achieve socio-economic stability and recovery through the implementation of quick-impact projects incorporated within peace support missions, which should therefore be supported. These provide early peace dividends to local people and help in confidence-building and reconciliation, which are prerequisites for attaining sustainable peace and development in such situations.

The Continental Early Warning System of the African Union in particular is designed to ensure that development trends that could undermine or trigger insecurity are detected and addressed in a timely and preventive manner. This also emphasizes the importance of communications capability to the nexus between security and development.

The Panel of the Wise was established to draw on the wisdom and experiences of Africans with track records in addressing peace and security issues in order to provide early engagement with emerging situations of concern to prevent conflict from erupting and sapping already limited resources from development. However, it has also been well established that predictable and sustainable funding is crucial both for timely and effective conflict prevention and for the long-term consolidation of peace in order to sustain an environment conducive to development.

Ongoing processes of security sector reform should also help to enhance professionalization of the security sector, for instance to enable engineering and service corps to increase their contributions to national efforts to address the social and development needs of their peoples.

The African Union Border Programme, which has been mentioned by a number of speakers, is also seeking to address the challenges of secure movement around the continent and to help curb the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons, as well as other illicit transborder activities that fuel conflict and undermine development in a number of areas around the continent.

As has been underscored by several speakers, the African Union fully shares the view that post-conflict reconstruction and development constitute a key track for promoting integrated security and development objectives in countries emerging from conflict. It is within this context that the African Post-Conflict Reconstruction Policy Framework was adopted within just three years of the launch of the African Union. Related efforts, such as those of the African Ministerial Committee on Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development in the Sudan, clearly demonstrate both the feasibility and the benefits of linking security and development in such contexts.

In the same vein, we continue to express the appreciation of the African Union to the Peacebuilding Commission for its efforts on the five African countries on its agenda, and in particular for the leadership of Brazil, which has been crucial to the advances we have seen in a number of situations.

Having said that, we are also aware that the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) process have revealed the extent to which Africa remains vulnerable due to the persistent socio-economic and development challenges it faces — a situation that has been exacerbated by the financial and economic crisis. Current trends indicate that several African countries are unlikely to attain the MDGs by the target date of 2015. The African Union therefore seizes this opportunity to underscore the importance of ensuring that all possible steps are taken to help the African States to meet the MDGs in order eliminate some of the socio-economic and root causes of instability and insecurity in a number of countries on the continent.

On its part, the African Union launched the New Partnership for Africa's Development to implement its vision of renaissance and growth, and we seize this opportunity to underscore the importance of stronger support from the United Nations and international community for its implementation. In this context, the African Union also continues to develop partnerships with various bilateral and multilateral actors and with the African diaspora, civil society and expert

organizations, through which development and security are increasingly considered in an interlinked and integrated approach.

Furthermore, in its efforts to address some of the factors impeding the mobilization of resources for the continent's financial security and development, the African Union is currently conducting preparatory processes towards establishment of pan-African financial institutions, as provided for in article 19 of the Constitutive Act of the Union. These include three key institutions — the African Central Bank; the African Monetary Fund, to be based in Yaoundé, Cameroon; the African Investment Bank to be based in Abuja, Nigeria — and a pan-African stock exchange. The African Union is counting on the support of the international community for the successful launch of these institutions in order to harness the nexus between security and development.

In conclusion, we wish to note that, in its observance of 2010 as the Year of Peace and Security in Africa, the African Union launched various peace and security initiatives that brought together Government, private sector and civil society actors. This experience confirmed the view that opportunities abound for promoting linkages between security and development on the continent. Therefore, enhanced assistance is essential for regional organizations such as the African Union so that they may fully develop the capacity to leverage such opportunities in order to promote development on the continent. The African Union thus re-iterates its readiness to continue to participate in policy debates such as that today in the Council, and to implement in the field related opportunities arising within the continent and in partnership of the United Nations and international partners.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Sri Lanka.

Mr. Kohona (Sri Lanka): Let me at the outset thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this timely debate on security and development.

We endorse the statement made my Egypt on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

These deliberations will no doubt further inform our thinking on this crucial area and in our view are key to addressing security issues. Today's discussions will help us to expand our focus beyond the Security Council's primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security.

Sri Lanka's Government recognized very early that security and development went together. As the Secretary-General has said, without development, security will soon become untenable, and security is an essential element of development. In fact, successive Governments acknowledged that development was a key element in countering the security threat posed to my country by the terrorist group, the LTTE. Accordingly, over the years significant attention was given to a complex range of economic development initiatives.

Recognizing the importance of education in this approach, successive Governments, while maintaining funding for education elsewhere in the country, never reduced the funding and support provided to schools in areas then dominated by the LTTE, despite the consistent threat of children being recruited as child combatants by the terrorist group. As we know, UNICEF records indicate that over 5,700 children were recruited as child combatants by the LTTE. The number may have been much higher.

Similarly, conscious of the need to maintain health standards throughout the country, the Government continued to pump significant resources into areas dominated by the LTTE to maintain hospitals, clinics and medical staff.

Once the conflict ended, the Government became even more conscious of the need to expedite development and paid special attention to rehabilitation and reconstruction. Hundreds of miles of paved roads linking villages to towns were constructed. The national electricity grid was extended to many remote areas of the country, and bridges were built. Foreign direct investors were encouraged to locate their businesses away from the capital. Special attention is being paid to reviving agriculture, fisheries and tourism in the formerly conflict-affected areas. These efforts are bearing significant results.

The economic policies of the Government have borne fruit. Despite the fact that the 27 years of conflict cost the country $200 billion in lost opportunities, the per capita income doubled between 2005 and 2010 as Sri Lanka became a middle income country. Ninety-seven per cent of our children attend primary schools. Maternal mortality and child mortality have dropped to an all-time low level.

Inflation and unemployment are at a record low, and absolute poverty has decreased to 8.7 per cent.

Those indicators are clear evidence of Government policies that recognize economic development as a vital precondition to achieving security and normalcy. In fact, stability and economic development were used as incentives to encourage the Tamil civilians to leave the grip of the LTTE during the conflict. In 2007 and 2008, over 60,000 Tamil civilians fled the LTTE-dominated areas to live in the south of the country.

The same economic focus has been maintained by the Government since the end of the conflict in May 2009. Since then, despite dire predictions of the long-term concentration of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in camps and of hunger, malnutrition and disease, the Government, convinced of the need to restore economic activity in the formerly conflict-affected areas, has successfully returned 95 per cent of the IDPs to their own villages and towns within a very short period. The Government recognized early that keeping the IDPs in camps was a costly proposition, both in dollars and public relations, and that it would be much better to make them economically active in their own villages as early as possible. The Government will continue to provide assistance to those people so that they may resume normal economic activities.

There have been no instances of diseases. Malnutrition is no higher among the people who returned to their villages from the IDP camps than in certain other areas of the country, and it is currently the subject of a broad study.

The Government recognizes that problems still remain. While many irrigation canals have been repaired, hundreds of miles of roads have been reconstructed and electricity supplies have been restored or connected, much more needs to be done to restore the lives and livelihoods of the displaced to a reasonable level, including by clearing mines from villages. The unprecedented floods that have inundated the lands of the same unfortunate people have put the clock back on our targets. But Sri Lanka has clearly recognized that economic development is a key to ensuring security, restoring stability and rekindling hope for the future among the conflict-affected people.

My delegation is of the view that better education, social advancement and economic development are key to addressing the root causes of violence. Our focus on those areas needs to be maintained. The multilateral system, led by the United Nations, must enhance coordination, cooperation and effective action with the goal of supporting development as a key element of ensuring security.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan.

Mr. Musayev (Azerbaijan): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the initiative to hold this open debate on the interdependence between security and development. This debate indeed offers an opportunity to advance the already intense international dialogue on the issue, taking into consideration the conclusions reached by relevant recent discussions in the Security Council.

A number of key issues in conflict and post-conflict situations need to be dealt with from the perspectives of both security and development. Acknowledging the interdependence between security and development, we are determined to contribute to the realization of the development goals and objectives agreed within the United Nations. The Government of Azerbaijan is committed to fostering global cooperation in all spheres, paying particular attention to addressing the special needs of those suffering protracted conflicts and recovering from natural disasters.

Despite the scourge of war and the devastating consequences of military aggression, Azerbaijan is fully committed to, and making sustained efforts for, maintaining international peace, security, stability and development. My Government has successfully launched and is implementing a number of important regional development and infrastructure projects, which benefit from regional stakeholders and lay the foundation for long-term peace, stability and prosperity.

As the concept paper on the subject (see S/2011/50) points out, not all peoples facing development challenges and suffering from poverty resort to violence. Indeed, certain political and ideological concepts, as well as historical stereotypes, can contribute to the eruption or protraction of, or relapse into, conflict, thus inevitably affecting in the first place development interests and imposing unnecessary burdens. We need to work on addressing all the root causes of conflict, taking into account that

development, peace, security, human rights and the rule of law are interlinked and mutually reinforcing.

The major aggravating factor and the main source of instability in the South Caucasus are obviously protracted armed conflicts, which represent a permanent and direct threat to the security, independence and development of the States of the region. It is obvious that ensuring security, stability and development in the region will be possible once we are able to achieve a resolution of the conflicts in a committed manner.

As the joint declaration of the Republic of Armenia, the Republic of Azerbaijan and the Russian Federation signed on 2 November 2008 clearly states, a political settlement will create favourable conditions for economic development and comprehensive cooperation in the region. Indeed, the resolution of the conflict, resulting in putting an end to the occupation of the territories of Azerbaijan and ensuring the return of the forcibly displaced population to its places of origin, is an essential precondition to mutually beneficial cooperation and the implementation of development agendas. It is obvious that there can be no development without peace, which, at the same time, is unrealistic without justice and respect for sovereignty, human rights and the rule of law.

The Government of Azerbaijan has repeatedly stated, in the context of the conflict settlement process, that it is ready to assist with the rebuilding of infrastructure and economic development in all possible ways, including the attraction of investment at the local level. The earlier that wisdom prevails over illusion, the sooner the peoples of the region will be able to benefit from peace, stability and development.

The President: The representative of the Russian Federation has asked for the floor to make a further statement.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would first like to congratulate you, Mr. President, and the delegation of Brazil on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and on organizing this debate on such an important issue as the interdependence between security and development.

During this debate, many very interesting statements on the topic have been made. Unfortunately, I must point out that this discussion also included a statement from the representative of Georgia. It is not difficult to understand that, in a Security Council debate, factual and legal clarity on that statement is needed. There was mention of the occupied territories of Georgia. If we say that, logically there is reference to Abkhazia and South Ossetia, that is, those countries and peoples that suffered the aggression of Georgia in the early 1990s and in August 2008.

If we talk about that from the legal standpoint, of course, it cannot involve occupation. Indeed, recognizing the sovereignty of those States, Russia reached agreement with them on mutual assistance and took responsibility for the security of Abkhazia and South Ossetia and for the safety of their peoples. However, there is no occupying regime there. Their Government is being ensured by the authorities of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, in accordance with the democratic will of their peoples.

The representative of Georgia referred to Georgia's pledge not to use force against Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Of course, Mr. Saakashvili made such a statement and, furthermore, he sent a letter on the issue to the Secretary-General. Most important, there was also letter by the authorities of Abkhazia and South Ossetia to the Secretary-General. They were circulated as official documents of the Security Council. I hope that members of the Council and all members of our Organization have read them. They provided an opportunity to read about what Russia has said for many years, that is, that before the August 2008 conflict, and after it, a regime of mutual legal obligations between Georgia and Abkhazia and South Ossetia on the non-use of force had been established.

Mr. Saakashvili also said publicly — he spoke on the radio — that he invited the inhabitants of Georgia to celebrate the next new year in Sukhumi, the capital of Abkhazia. Of course, that could only give rise to serious doubt about the intentions of that politician, who, as is known, had already often broken his promises.

Recently, we have said much about the fact that politicians sometimes must work in the interests of their people. Mr. Saakashvili committed a criminal act with regard to the invasion of South Ossetia and, thus, infringed that. The authorities of Georgia have unpredictable policies and the Georgian people are suffering with regard to their prospects for development.

The President: The representative of Georgia has asked for the floor to make a further statement.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tsiskarashvili (Georgia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Georgia.

Mr. Tsiskarashvili (Georgia): The Russian Federation attempts to downplay the importance of the pledge of non-use of force made by the President of Georgia on 23 November in the European Parliament, and later reinforced in the letters to the heads of various international organizations, including the Secretary-General.

The pledge of Georgia not to use force against the Russian occupying forces and the proxy regimes in the name of restoring Georgia's territorial integrity remains an international legal obligation of Georgia no matter how Russia tries to downplay its significance. Georgia is seriously committed to pursuing a peaceful agenda towards its occupied regions, as exemplified by the calls to engage in dialogue with Russian authorities, as well as with the populations of the occupied regions.

Russia needs to start living up to its obligations under international law. By continuing the policy of violating Georgia's territorial integrity, by breaching the 12 August 2008 ceasefire agreement, by further militarizing the occupied regions, by rejecting all offers of dialogue and by pursuing aggressive military rhetoric against Georgia, Russia will hardly manage to change the perception of my country that Russia is a hostile State.

I would like here to remind representatives that Russia committed military aggression against Georgia in 2008. It continues to occupy 20 per cent of Georgia's territory. Russia committed ethnic cleansing of ethnic Georgians in 2008. All those violations are duly reflected in the findings of the International Independent Fact-Finding Mission on the Conflict in Georgia, led by the Swiss diplomat Heidi Tagliavini. Moreover, the Russian Federation's decision to recognize the so-called independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia was considered a serious breach of international law by the international Fact-Finding Mission.

Finally, the illegal military presence of Russia and its effective control of the occupied territories of Georgia make the Russian Federation an occupying Power, and all the responsibility for the situation in the occupied territories lies with Russia.

The President: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.